



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



151

2

NEW EDITION
OF THE
BABYLONIAN TALMUD

Original Text, Edited, Corrected, Formulated, and
Translated into English

BY
MICHAEL L. RODKINSON

SECTION MOED (FESTIVALS)
TRACTS YOMAH AND HAGIGA

Volume VI.
LIBRARY
LELAND STANFORD JUNIOR
UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK
NEW TALMUD PUBLISHING COMPANY
54 EAST 106TH STREET

EXPLANATORY REMARKS.

In our translation we adopted these principles:

1. *Tenan* of the original—We have learned in a Mishna; *Tania*—We have learned in a Boraitha; *Itemar*—It was taught.
2. Questions are indicated by the interrogation point, and are immediately followed by the answers, without being so marked.
3. When in the original there occur two statements separated by the phrase, *Lishna achrena* or *Waibayith Aema* or *Ikha d'amri* (literally, "otherwise interpreted"), we translate only the second.
4. As the pages of the original are indicated in our new Hebrew edition, it is not deemed necessary to mark them in the English edition, this being only a translation from the latter.
5. Words or passages enclosed in round parentheses () denote the explanation rendered by Rashi to the foregoing sentence or word. Square parentheses [] contain commentaries by authorities of the last period of construction of the Gemara.

107337

VRASHELI
ROMALA OBORNATZ OMALI
VTEIGERIM VIMU

COPYRIGHT, 1899, BY
MICHAEL L. RODKINSON.

TO THE
VENERABLE PRESIDENT OF THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE
AND OF THE CENTRAL AMERICAN RABBIS' CONFERENCE

THE REV. DR. ISAAC M. WISE

AT HIS
EIGHTIETH BIRTHDAY

THIS VOLUME WITH THE ENTIRE SECTION MOED, IS MOST RESPECT-
FULLY DEDICATED BY HIS SINCERE FRIEND

MICHAEL L. RODKINSON

NEW YORK, 1899.

YAH (DAY OF ATONEMENT)

MOST HONORED RABBI:

When, five years ago, in the month of October, I had the honor to visit you, and then expressed my sorrow in not being able to attend your seventy-fifth birthday. I promised you that I would write a work and dedicate it to you for your eightieth birthday. Now, after the lapse of five years, I praise God that He has preserved us both. I have fulfilled my promise, and written a work on the History of the Talmud, which I believe to be of some value, with the intention of dedicating it to you. but my circumstances do not allow me to publish it in time for your celebration. However, I redeem my promise in dedicating to you the Section Moed, which at that time I had no intention of translating into English.

I hope to see your ninetieth birthday, when, among all your disciples and admirers who will celebrate it, I also may take part.

M. L. R.

TRACT YOMAH (DAY OF ATONEMENT)

EXPRESSION OF THANKS.

WITH the issue of this volume this section is almost complete (the last two volumes being in press), and I deem it my duty to express my heartfelt thanks to my patrons and supporters during the last three years, ever since my work was undertaken. Through their support I have been enabled to reach my present position. This is the first time in the history of the Talmud that an entire section of it was translated into a living and comprehensible language, making it easily understood even to a layman. The synopsis of each tract indicates where the most interesting ethical and folkloristic portions may be found, thereby rendering the various tracts readily understood, even by one who is not a student.

Three years ago, when I made up my mind to begin this work, I scarcely dared hope that thirteen* tracts of the most difficult part of the Talmud would be translated, more especially that seven of them, the most voluminous, would be published in the course of two years. Notwithstanding all the obstacles that were laid in my way by personal enemies, and notwithstanding all the financial difficulties† which I had to surmount, I have succeeded in accomplishing the work mentioned above, chiefly through the aid of the few gentlemen who have encouraged me by enlisting their sympathy and interest in my work, and who also supported me financially;‡ not as a matter of charity, but

* The translation of one tract of section Jurisprudence is also already completed.

† It must be borne in mind that the cost of publishing one volume is \$700 or more.

‡ In my "History of the Talmud" I take notice of the writers who complain that the Jewish people were always opposed to the translation of Jewish lore into foreign languages. They, moreover, assert that all the translations of the Bible, and all the collections of Hebrew manuscripts, as also the Massorah, were supported by different governments and private Gentiles. Zunz ("Ges. Schr.", vol. i., p. 296), in recommending a translation of the Talmud, also relates (p. 273) that the Russian Government, in July, 1829, paid 12,000 thalers to the Abbé Chiarini for a translation of the Talmud in the French language. In one of his works, issued at Paris, the latter complains that the Hebrews opposed and prevented him from accomplishing his commission. See also Wolfsohn's "Jeschurun," p. 242, Breslau,

in the form of a subscription and payment in advance for the forthcoming volumes, for the issue of which in due time they have reposed their confidence in me.

Many friends have assured me that this work is destined to become historical, and as the Talmud has indeed a great history, the first translation of it in a foreign tongue cannot fail to attract attention, and therefore I trust that my work will add somewhat in demonstrating its value and importance. In that event all the names of my supporters and sympathizers who will be known to the future historian (which may be after my death) will be mentioned with honor.

With this view in mind, I enumerate herewith with grateful acknowledgment the names of my supporters since this work began, and especially those who aided me during the last two months of the past year, and enabled me to publish the present volume by paying for from twenty-seven to ten forthcoming volumes, at the rate of \$2.50 each, in advance. May God bless and prosper them in all their undertakings!

I also extend my thanks to all my subscribers, far and near, for their kindness in the past, hoping at the same time that it will be extended in the future. I am also grateful to the rabbis of the city of New York, who, with very few exceptions, sympathize with my work, and have assisted me with their influence and subscriptions.

The list of patrons is arranged alphabetically. The asterisk indicates that the volumes already delivered and paid for are NOT included. Asterisk and dagger indicate also the subscription for two sets. The list of names on page ix shows those added during the last two months of the past year.

| | | |
|--|----|----------|
| Cowen, Newman | 20 | volumes. |
| Hirsch, Baroness Clara de..... | 30 | " |
| Lewisohn, Leonard..... | 20 | " |
| Rothschild, Baron Edmond de (through the Grand Rabbin de France, Zadoc Kahn, ¹ who is himself a subscriber) | 25 | " |
| Seligman, Prof. Edwin R. A.*†..... | 20 | " |
| Sulzberger, Judge Mayer..... | 24 | " |

1804. It is also a well-known fact that Emperor Nicholas I. of Russia assigned 100,000 rubles for a translation of the Talmud; and that Dr. Pinner, who translated tract Berachoth into German, a work considered of little merit by all scholars, nevertheless received 10,000 rubles from him. A German translation of the Talmud is now being published through the effort of Gentiles. I am proud to say that I am the first who has not sought the support of Gentiles, and that all that I have done was brought about by my coreligionists.

חכרא לмерיה טיבוֹתא לשׂאַה :

EXPRESSION OF THANKS.

ix

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Abraham, A.* Brooklyn..... | 20 volumes. |
| Adler, Prof. Felix *..... | 10 " |
| Borg, Simon | 10 " |
| Friedlander, Albert..... | 10 " |
| Gans, Louis * | 10 " |
| Greenbaum, Samuel *..... | 10 " |
| Hays, Daniel P..... | 20 " |
| Hirsch, Nathan,* of Joseph Hirsch & Son..... | 10 " |
| Isaacs, Bendet *..... | 20 " |
| Josephi, Isaiah | 20 " |
| Knopf, Samuel * | 10 " |
| Lehman, Emanuel * | 10 " |
| Marshall, Louis *..... | 20 " |
| Platzek, M. Warley*† | 20 " |
| Plaut, Louis,* Newark..... | 10 " |
| Rice, Isaac L.*..... | 10 " |
| Saks, Andrew * | 27 " |

I have to thank once more the following gentlemen and lady, who, besides their subscriptions, have also exerted their influence in insuring me a considerable number of subscribers:

Messrs. Samuel Greenbaum, Daniel P. Hays, Isaiah Josephi, Andrew Saks, and Miss Annette Kohn.

I trust that in the last volume of this section this list of supporters will be greatly increased, as I still need further assistance, till the section is completed, when I am confident that I will derive good financial returns from its sale to booksellers and general agents, who are awaiting the completion of the section, to be sold *en masse* as a complete work by itself.

I am hopeful that the coming generation will be grateful to all those who took part in opening a sealed book to the eyes of the world.

Finally, I express my thanks to my printer, ex-Congressman Hon. Joseph J. Little, who has granted me considerable credit in his establishment, thereby greatly lightening the burden of my work; also to his proofreader for calling my attention to many matters which seemed to him imperfect, and whose assistance I value greatly; and last, but not least, to Mr. A. S. Freidus of the New York Public Library, for many valuable suggestions in bibliographical and other matters.

MICHAEL L. RODKINSON.



CONTENTS.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| DEDICATION, | v |
| EXPRESSION OF THANKS, | vii |
| INTRODUCTION, | xiii |
| SYNOPSIS OF SUBJECTS OF VOLUME VI.—TRACT YOMAH, . . | xvii |

CHAPTER I.

| | |
|---|---|
| CONCERNING THE HIGH-PRIEST'S PREPARATIONS FOR THE SERVICE OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT (WHEN THE TEMPLE WAS IN EXISTENCE), | i |
|---|---|

CHAPTER II.

| | |
|---|----|
| CONCERNING THE LOTS THE PRIESTS DREW, WHAT PRIESTS SHOULD GO TO THE ALTAR, AND HOW MANY PRIESTS WERE NEEDED FOR EACH SACRIFICE, | 30 |
|---|----|

CHAPTER III.

| | |
|--|----|
| REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE TIME OF SLAUGHTERING THE DAILY OFFERING, THE ENTERING OF A LAYMAN INTO THE COURT OF THE TEMPLE, AND THE ORDER OF THE HIGH-PRIEST'S SERVICE ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT, . . | 40 |
|--|----|

CHAPTER IV.

| | |
|---|----|
| REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE TWO GOATS OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT: HOW THEY WERE SLAUGHTERED, SENT AWAY, ETC., | 58 |
|---|----|

CHAPTER V.

| | |
|--|----|
| REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE REMAINING SERVICES OF THE HIGH-PRIEST ON THIS DAY IN THE TIMES OF THE FIRST AND SECOND TEMPLES, | 69 |
|--|----|

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER VI.

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE HE-GOATS OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT AND THE SENDING TO THE DESERT, AND THE CONFESSION THEREAT, | 87 |

CHAPTER VII.

| | |
|--|----|
| REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE PASSAGES READ BY THE HIGH-PRIEST, AND WHAT GARMENTS HE MINISTERED IN AFTER, AND WHAT GARMENTS OTHER PRIESTS WORE, | 98 |
|--|----|

CHAPTER VIII.

| | |
|---|-----|
| REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE FASTING ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT, WHAT MAY BE DONE THEREON, AND WHAT MAY NOT BE DONE, | 112 |
|---|-----|

| | |
|---------------------|-----|
| APPENDIX, | 143 |
|---------------------|-----|

INTRODUCTION TO TRACT YOMAH, OR THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

THE first seven chapters treat of the manner in which the Day of Atonement was celebrated in the second Temple: the different sacrifices brought on that day, the preparation of the high-priest for his ministry, and the order of service as he performed it, entering fully into minute details of every circumstance connected therewith. Although all this has an historical value only, we cannot refrain from giving an introduction to this tract, on account of that day being so different from all the holidays of Israel.

All the festivals, although they were not observed all the time during the first Temple, were nevertheless observed by some of the kings, who invoked the people to celebrate them some of the time; *e.g.*, the Feast of Passover, with all its sacrifices, in the reigns of Hezekiah and Josiah [2 Chron. xxx. ; xxxv.]. There is also related [*ibid.* xxxv. 18], that in the days of the prophet Samuel, Passover was held. The Feast of Tabernacles was celebrated in the days of Solomon [1 Kings viii. 2], and although the children of Israel did not dwell in the booths since the days of Joshua b. Nun [Neh. viii. 17], nevertheless the feast was celebrated with all its appertaining sacrifices; and also the Pentecost they have kept [2 Chron. viii. 13]. The Day of Atonement, however, is not mentioned in the entire Scriptures, with the exception of Lev. xvi., and among the prescription of the various sacrifices; but even then we see something unusual among the commandments of the Scriptures; namely, the remark that he (Aaron) did as the Lord had commanded Moses.*

* Reading the Scriptures critically, we deem that Lev. xvi. is merely a continuation of Lev. x., where the death of the two sons of Aaron is related when they entered the sanctuary; and after that Aaron is instructed as to the manner in which he can enter the sanctuary *so he shall not die*. In the entire chapter xvi. no mention is made of the Day of Atonement, except that from verse 29 to the end of the chapter, we find the command that it shall be a statute forever for all the Israelites, that on the tenth day of the seventh month the high-priest shall make an atonement

Moreover, we can plainly see from the Scriptures, that at the time of King Solomon the Day of Atonement was one of the seven days of rejoicing, at the dedication of the Temple [1 Kings viii.; 2 Chron. vii. 8, 9]; and although it is said in the Talmud that the decision not to keep the Day of Atonement was only a temporary one (as it will be explained in Tract Moed Katan), still we cannot rely upon an individual opinion in the Talmud. The facts are that the Day of Atonement was not observed, not only during the first Temple, but at the beginning of the second as well, for even in Nehemiah the Feast of Tabernacles is mentioned, but the Day of Atonement is not. And even during the middle period of the second Temple the Talmud states that the Day of Atonement was one of the holidays for the people, in which the daughters of Israel, all dressed in white, went forth to dance in the vineyards, as will be explained in Tract Taanith. It would be ridiculous to believe that, while observing the five afflictions of the day (see chapter viii. of this tract), they nevertheless danced and sang, trying to captivate the youths.

Ewald, in speaking of that day, also remarks that it is different in its respect from all the holidays; but even he does not explain the reason. He only indicates that it may be a remnant of the pre-Mosaic time. In order to give the reader an opportunity of forming his own opinion, we herewith give an extract from Ewald concerning the Day of Atonement:

"The preparatory celebration in the autumn, which took place on the tenth day of the seventh month, was essentially distinguished from that of the spring in not being a terror-stricken celebration at the commencement of the year, which sought to avert the perils of the dim future and, as it were, the wrath of a new coming God, but in being rather a pure feast of penance which endeavored to expiate all the human and national transgressions and impurities which had occurred during the year. For although the searching stringency of Jahveism, already described, required that every, even the smallest, impurity and defilement which had been contracted should be immediately expiated, yet the higher religion was well aware how little all the

for his brother priests, for the sanctuary, and for the people of Israel; but there is no command that he, on that day, shall perform all the ceremonies prescribed in the same chapter, for that concerns only the entrance of Aaron into the sanctuary. Also Ewald has considered this point; and it is possible that the sages, during the first Temple, interpreted this passage in the same manner, and all the sages after them, until the middle period of the second Temple, since when the learned priests, for a reason unknown to us, decided that the entire chapter relates to the Day of Atonement; and the sages of the Talmud, on account of this, afterwards deduced from the scriptural passages the elaborate manner of the service on that day to be found in the Talmud.

secret and slowly advancing desecrations were actually removed from the entire community. Hence this universal festival of penance and expiation was established in order that even all these might be expiated as far as human labor could avail, and that the community, as free as possible from all guilt, might celebrate with joyous feelings the great happy festival of the year which immediately followed. Both this origin and purpose, and also its name, *feast of expiation*, show its genuine Mosaic character. Here, more than in any other, the entire purpose and the absolute stringency of the higher religion found expression, and it was certainly this religion which first founded the festival. Only in one of its rites, which, strictly speaking, is hardly essential, do we find a remnant of pre-Mosaic belief and life. The festival, then, was by no means to be principally of a domestic character, like the Passover; rather, in contradistinction to the latter, was it to become a thoroughly public festival. Accordingly, the people were not to offer any of the regular sacrifices, but a new one, which should go deeper and reach a more sensitive point in taming man's sensuous nature than the regular offerings. This was to be a rigid fast from the evening of the ninth to that of the tenth; the solitary fast which Jahveism annually required. The whole structure of Jahveism did indeed require that a sacrifice of the ordinary kind should be offered on this day, as its peculiar importance demanded; but this continued to be purely sacerdotal. It was a great expiatory offering, to be made by the high-priest or his representative. Not only the human members of the community, including the priests, were now deemed impure and in need of expiation, but even the visible sanctuary as well, as though, like a wall between the nation and its God, it received all the stains of impiety which were incurred in the realm. Hence the high-priest employed expiatory offerings of two kinds: one, purely sacerdotal and serving especially for the atonement of the sanctuary, and another, which had special reference to the share of the community, and must therefore also proceed from it. The latter bore quite a national stamp, and evidently forms that portion of the usages which was derived from a pre-Mosaic time, and still retained subsequently." ("The Antiquities of Israel," by H. Ewald, pages 361 to 364, which see.)

It seems to us that Ewald's opinion is not altogether right. We do not agree that this festival shows more of the Mosaic character than any other festival, nor with his opinion about the he-goat destined for Azazel, which he considers a pre-Mosaic rite. He is also not correct in saying that there were no regular sacrifices on that day, only new ones [*vide* Num. xxix. 7, 8], for the simple reason, if such was the case it would have been observed at the beginning of the second Temple, at least, when the entire Law, as we now have it, was discovered by Ezra; but, as stated above, the observance of that day with pomp and celebration (see Appendix) was begun some time during the middle period of the second Temple.

On the contrary, from the great preparations and parade of

the high-priest to and from the Temple, and from other matters which took place during the service itself, we would be inclined to believe that the Hellenism which crept into Judaism has served a great deal towards their origination ; and also concerning the he-goat destined for Azazel we have something to say, but as we do not like to lay before our readers the grounds for our supposition, we refrain from making our statement. We content ourselves with referring the reader to the book "Daath Elohim ba-Arez" ("The Knowledge of God in the Land"), by Abraham Krochmal, where he will find some hints concerning the Azazel of the Scripture and the Tsuk (rock of its destination) of the Mishna, and leave to him to form an opinion of the time of its origin.

Concerning the services proper at the Temple, we have to translate here for our English readers what we have already written in our Hebrew commentary to Tract Shekalim, chapter iv., Mishna D : "From this Mishna we can see that during the time of the Temple the leaders of the priests kept everything secret, and their customs were not known to any one else ; otherwise there could not have been a dispute concerning the services there immediately after the destruction of the Temple. Moreover, R. Ishmael, himself a priest, and his forefathers, Elisha and Ishmael, were prominent priests during the time of the Temple; also R. Hanina the Segan was one of the prominent priests, still they knew not exactly the ceremonies and the manner of their performance, and differed in their opinions greatly. This must be borne in mind by the readers of the tracts treating the services and sacrifices."

We have added to this volume the Tract Hagiga, as it relates to the sacrifices of the festivals, and is also of great historical value. Although in the old edition the Tract Hagiga is next to Moed Katan, the last of section Moed, still in our new edition we could not keep up the old rotation, as we have divided the volumes of the above section in approximately uniform size, and each part contains a complete tract. Nevertheless we number the pages of each tract separately, in order that if any one wishes to bind the volumes in the old order, there should be no hindrance.

NEW YORK, January, 1899.

SYNOPSIS OF SUBJECTS

OF

VOLUME VI.—TRACT YOMAH.*

CHAPTER I.

MISHNA I. Why the high priest, before the Day of Atonement, and the priest who had to perform the ceremonies of the red cow, were removed from their houses to different chambers in the Temple, and whence we deduce it from the Scriptures. About a substitute of the high-priest. How is it known, when one person communicates something to another, that one has no right to tell it to a third without permission? How did Moses attire Aaron and his children on the days of consecration? Whether the uncleanness of the entire congregation, contracted from a corpse, is not considered, or only postponed. How were the two priests sprinkled? The number of high-priests during the first and second Temples. Why had the first Temple fallen? The second Temple, where the occupations were study of the Law, religious duties, and charity—why fell it? Which one of the Temples was better? Which of the nations are descended from Japheth? Whether the gates of the Temple needed Mezuzahs. Of what material was the girdle of the high-priest made, and whether it was the same as those of the common priests. How was the substitute of the high-priest recognized when the high-priest became unfit during the service, 1-18

MISHNA II. What kind of experience did the high-priest have during the seven days? What shall he do first—trim the lamps or prepare the incense? On what altar and what corner must the blood be sprinkled, 18-22

MISHNAS III. to V. What the elders of the Beth Din say to him. What he is free to eat during the seven days, and what on the eve of the Day of Atonement. How the priest selects the offerings he chooses. How the Beth Din left him to the elders of the priests, and what they made him swear. What a high-priest of the Sadducees had done, and what happened to him. What was done when the high-priest began to slumber. How he was occupied, and what was sung to him. How were the ashes cleared away every day and on the Day of Atonement? The miracles that occurred in the Temple. For the crowing of what cock shall one wait before going on the road any night? About the heavenly fire at the second Temple, 22-29

*See introduction to synopsis in Tract Sabbath, Vol. I., p. xxix.; also note at end of synopsis in Vol. V.

CHAPTER II.

MISHNAS I. to V. Why the priests were selected by lot in the latter days, and not before. Why Israel must not be counted. How secure and careless should the man feel that knows that the Lord helps him. What is called revenge, and what is called bearing a grudge? The reward of him who leaves his injuries unavenged. The accident that befell two priests. For performing certain four services a layman deserves capital punishment. In what garments were the lots drawn? Were the lots drawn for each service separately? In what order the members of the sacrifice were offered. The daily sacrifices are offered by nine, ten, eleven, twelve priests. How so? A ram was offered by eleven, a bull by twenty-four, 30-39

CHAPTER III.

MISHNAS I. to IV. What the Superintendent used to say to the priests, and why all this was necessary. What is said about the heat during a clouded day. Rules for entering the Temple for all. Why and where the high-priest bathed five times, and washed his hands and feet ten times. How is it known from the Holy Scriptures? How the service was. When one meets an opportunity to perform a meritorious act. If he was an aged or delicate high-priest, what was then? Concerning the garments of the high-priest and their value. What happened to Hillel, to Eliezer b. Harsum, and Joseph the Upright, 40-49

MISHNAS V. to VII. How did the high-priest confess? and what the people responded after him. Which of the officers were on his right and which were on his left during the service? What Ben Katin made for the Temple, and what his mother Queen Helen made. Concerning the house of Garmo, the house of Abtinas, and Hogros b. Levi (the preparer of shew-bread, incense, etc.). What one of the members of the house of Abtinas related to R. Ishmael. Whence is it derived from the Pentateuch that when the names of the just are mentioned they must be blessed, and, *vice versa*, those of the wicked? When a man sanctifies himself a little here below, he is sanctified much above, 49-57

CHAPTER IV.

MISHNAS I. to III. Concerning the lots of the two he-goats, how they were taken from the boxes, and of what material the boxes were made. What happened when Simeon the Upright was high-priest, and after. Simeon the Upright told the sages: "This year I am going to die." "How dost thou know?" About the six times the high-priest pronounced God's name, as it is written, during the Day of Atonement. About the tongue of crimson wool which was tied to the head of the goat that was to be sent away, and for the red cow, etc. Concerning the slaughter of the red cow by a layman. What is the reason that a female may not perform the ceremony of sprinkling? The measure of the censer in which the coals for the incense were taken, and of what material it was made, and of what color it was on the Day of Atonement. There were seven kinds of gold. Whence is it deduced that a special fire was made that day, 58-68

CHAPTER V.

MISHNAS I. to VI. About the two handfuls of incense for the Holy of Holies, and how it was used. What concerning the incense between the middle fingers? When he had filled his hands with incense, and suddenly died, how then? If he died while slaughtering, might the blood be sprinkled? The difference of opinion between R. Jose and the sages about the vail of the Holy of Holies. The ell of the entrance (to the Holy of Holies) was a matter of doubt to the sages. About the ark in the first and second Temples. He departed in the same manner as he had come (backwards). Whence do we deduce this? The custom of the disciples when departing from their masters. The difference of opinion between the sages about the ark: according to some it was taken into exile in Babylon, and according to others it was concealed in its place in the Temple. The world was created from the very middle, beginning with the extremities. Everything was created from Zion. How many times had he to sprinkle downwards? One and one, one and two, etc. What was the law when the bloods of the bullock and the goat got mingled? Whence does he begin (the sprinkling)? The difference of opinion of some sages about this matter. Whether one is guilty when using the blood for his own purpose. How is the law if he performed the services in a wrong order, or in the wrong clothes? Whether the atonement for all sins includes the sin of uncleanness in the Temple or not, 69-86

CHAPTER VI.

MISHNAS I. to V. The equality of the two he-goats. The law if one of them dies after the lots were cast. If a substitute was selected, and then the first one was found. The expression of the high-priest at his confession on the he-goat for Azazel. How the priest delivered the he-goat to its conductor. The question which R. Eliezer was asked, and his answers. How the prominent men of Jerusalem used to accompany the messenger of the he-goat. How far was Jerusalem from the Tsuk (the rock of its destination)? What was done with the tongue of crimson wool, and its signification. About the ten booths between Jerusalem and the Tsuk, and how at each booth the messenger was offered meat and drink. Whether the high-priest was told when the he-goat reached its destination, or it was made known to him by a sign, 87-97

CHAPTER VII.

MISHNAS I. to III. How the high-priest came to read (the Torah), and in what clothes, and what section, and who were the persons that passed the holy scrolls from one to another until it reached the high-priest. The legend of Alexander the Macedonian and the high-priest Simeon the Upright. The legends about the tempter to idolatry, how he was caught in the time of Ezra and was burned to death. Also the legend of the tempter to fornication, how he was kept prisoner, was blinded in both eyes, and then liberated. Concerning the Great Assembly which has renewed the appellations of our God, the great, the mighty, and the terrible, said by Moses, and which some of the prophets left out. What the high-priest did after reading the Torah. At what time the bullock and the seven sheep of the burnt-offerings were offered. How the conductor of the he-goat informs the high-priest that he fulfilled his duty. How the Urim and Tumim were

made. How they were inquired of, and to whom. What letters were inserted in them. About the three crowns of the altar, the ark, and the table, who received them? About the priest who was anointed for war, his garments, services, and descendants. How was the ceremony of inquiring the Urim and Tumim, and how the priest received the reply. Whence do we deduce that the inquiries are made for kings only? . . . 98-111

CHAPTER VIII.

MISHNA I. The afflictions which are obligatory on the Day of Atonement. What were the afflictions coming from the manna written in Deuteronomy viii. 16? The visage of the Lord is not like that of a man. How the manna betrayed all the secrets of the Israelites. What is the meaning of the bread of Abirim? What R. Aqiba said, and what R. Ishmael answered him. The question why the manna did not descend for the Israelites once a year, and its answer. What R. Eliezer the Modeite had to say about the manna, which R. Ishmael called a gathering of nonsensical words. How is it known that abstaining from washing and anointing is an affliction? What is the law in regard of one being soiled in clay, etc., whether he may wash himself? When a man goes to receive his father, master, or superior, and has to wade in water reaching to his neck? About the spring that issued from the Holy of Holies. Whether a great man is permitted to decide the question of a blemish of a firstling, and what R. Tzadok b. 'Haluqah answered. Whether children are to observe the afflictions? The quantity of food and beverage prohibited from partaking on the Day of Atonement, 112-122

MISHNAS II. to V. What is the law regarding one who ate and drank through forgetfulness? At what age are children made to fast some hours on the Day of Atonement? When a pregnant woman longs for the food which she has smelled. When a man is seized with bulimy, what he may eat, etc. What happened to some rabbis who were seized with bulimy. When a man is bitten by a mad dog. The five things mentioned as symptoms of a dog's madness. What happened to R. Johanan and the matron of Rome. How the Sabbath must be superseded when life is threatened. The question put to R. Ishmael, R. Aqiba, and R. Eliezer b. Azariah when on the road about the same, and what they answered, . . . 122-132

MISHNA VI. For what transgressions the Day of Atonement atones. Does the Day of Atonement atone him who says: I will sin and God will forgive me? What penitence atones for? What R. Eliezer b. Azariah, while in Rome, was asked by R. Mathiah b. Heresh, and what he answered. What is called defamation of God. How penitence is great: it reaches the throne of His glory. How repentance is great: when an individual repents, the whole world is pardoned. Whether one who has confessed his sins on one Day of Atonement has also to confess on the next one? The sin of Moses is compared to a woman who has eaten fruit on the Sabbatical year, and David's to a woman who has really sinned. He who has provoked his neighbor, even by words, must appease him. At what place in the prayer should he confess? What the disciples of R. Ishmael taught, . . 132-142

APPENDIX. The letter of a Gentile who has witnessed the ceremonies of Passover, and the procession of the high-priest to and from the Temple, 143-147

TRACT YOMAH (DAY OF ATONEMENT).

CHAPTER I.

CONCERNING THE HIGH-PRIEST'S PREPARATIONS FOR THE SERVICE
OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT (WHEN THE TEMPLE WAS IN
EXISTENCE).

MISHNA: Seven days before the Day of Atonement the high-priest is to be removed from his house to the Palhedrin Chamber (*παρεδρων*), and another high-priest is appointed to substitute him in case he become unfit for the service by becoming unclean. R. Jedudah says another wife is to be appointed for him also, in case his own wife dies, whereas it is said [Lev. xvii. 11], "and shall make atonement for himself and for his house"; "his house"—that is, his wife. But it was objected that in this manner there will be no end to the matter. (The other wife may die too.)

GEMARA: We have learned in a Mishna (Tract Parah, III., 1): "Seven days before the red cow * was to be burned, the priest who had to perform this ceremony was removed from his house to the northeastern chamber of the Temple," etc. "Whence do we deduce this?" said R. Miniumi bar Helviah in the name of Mahassia b. Iddi, quoting R. Johanan: "It is written [Lev. viii. 34]: 'As they have done this day, so hath the Lord commanded to do farther, to make an atonement for you.' 'To do farther' signifies the red cow; 'to make an atonement for you' signifies the Day of Atonement." But perhaps it signifies the atonement of sacrifices generally? Could we know, in this case,

* Some translators say [Numbers xix. 2] "red heifer"; but this would not be proper, according to the teaching of the Mishna that the red cow must not be younger than three years and is fit even from four to five years, for which the term *heifer* cannot be correctly used.

which priest is going to perform the rite? How, then, could he be removed from his home? But perhaps other festivals are meant? We infer the removal seven days before one day from the removal, seven days (before) for the service of one day,* but not seven days (before) for a service of seven days [of the festivals of Passover and of Tabernacles]. Perhaps Pentecost, which also is only one day, is meant? Said R. Abba: "We infer a day of one bull and one ram (when one such is sacrificed) [as on the days of consecration], from a day of one bull and one ram, which is the offering for the Day of Atonement; but for Pentecost two rams are prescribed." Perhaps New Year's Day is meant (which is also only one day)? Said R. Abahu: "We may infer a day of the bull and the ram at the priest's own cost from a day when the priest must act likewise, and that is the Day of Atonement. But on the days of Pentecost and of New Year the bull and ram are at the public cost." R. Ashi, however, said: "We may infer a day on which the bull is a sin-offering, and the ram a burnt-offering (as on the day of consecration and on the Day of Atonement), but on New Year's Day and Pentecost both are burnt-offerings."

Rabbina said: "We may infer from a day on which the service is allowed only to the high-priest a day on which the same is the case, but on the other festivals [than the Day of Atonement] the service is permitted to other priests.

R. Johanan taught: "Both phrases, 'to do farther' and 'to make an atonement,' refer only to one day, and that is the Day of Atonement." Resh Lakish, however, infers from the same two phrases—from "to do," the red cow, and "to make an atonement," the Day of Atonement (as stated previously). But how can R. Johanan infer only one of these, since we have learned that for the red cow the priest was also removed? That was not biblical, but optional. [To contradict the Sadducees, the priest was purposely made unclean, and therefore he was recompensed by honors, one of them that of being removed seven days before.]

When Rabbin came from Palestine, however, he said in the name of R. Johanan, quoting R. Ishmael: "By 'do farther' the red cow is meant, and by 'to make atonement' the Day of Atonement." Said Resh Lakish to him: "Whence do you deduce this? From the days of consecration! As on those

* See Lev. viii. 33.

days everything mentioned is obligatory, so on these occasions it should be. Perhaps you will say, it is so. But have we not learned that a substitute is prepared? and it is not written that the substitute must also be removed. If you will say, the substitute was likewise removed, then why does the Mishna say, the high-priest was removed, and a substitute was prepared? Let one expression be used concerning both."

Rejoined R. Johanan: "Whence do you, Master, deduce this?" He answered: "I deduce it from what occurred on Mount Sinai. As it is written [Ex. xxiv. 16]: 'And the glory of the Lord abode upon Mount Sinai, and the cloud covered it six days, and he called unto Moses on the seventh day.' Let us see. He called him on the seventh day; to what purpose were the six days? To make a rule for every man who must enter the abode of the Shekhina, that he must be separated six days." But did we not learn "seven days"? Six days are sufficient; but our Mishna is in accordance with R. Jehudah b. Bathyr, who says that seven days are requisite (as will be further explained).

Rejoined R. Johanan again to Resh Lakish: "It is, according to me, who deduce it from the days of consecration, that the following Boraitha should say, that on the priests on both occasions they sprinkled during all the seven days of preparation, from all the ashes of the red cows which were to be found there, because on the days of consecration there was also sprinkling. But according to you, who deduce it from Mount Sinai, where do you find sprinkling on Mount Sinai?" Resh Lakish answered: "Even according to your theory, are they equal? In the days of consecration the sprinkling was of blood, and here water." Rejoined R. Johanan: "It presents no difficulty; because R. Hiya taught the water was later substituted for the blood. But according to your theory, on Mount Sinai there was no sprinkling at all?" Resh Lakish answered: "The sprinkling was an optional improvement."

We have learned of one Boraitha which is in accordance with R. Johanan, and of another which is according to Resh Lakish. The one according to R. Johanan is as follows: It is written [Lev. xvi. 3]: "With this shall Aaron come into the holy place." The phrase "with this" means all that is said concerning the days of consecration. Namely, Aaron was separated seven days, and served but one; during the seven days Moses instructed him, to make him acquainted with the service. So it

should be in later generations; the high-priest should be separated for seven days, and serve one day, and two scholars of the disciples of Moses, excepting Sadducees, were placed in his society during the seven days to make him be practised in the service. Therefore it has been said, seven days before the Day of Atonement the high-priest must be removed from his house to the chamber of Palhedrin. And as the high-priest was separated, so the priest who was to burn the red cow was to be removed to the chamber in the northeast of the Temple. Both priests used to be sprinkled during all the seven days from the ashes of the red cow. And if you will say, on this occasion water of the ashes was sprinkled, and on the days of consecration it was blood that was sprinkled, it can be replied, that that water was a substitute for the blood, as it is written: "As they have done this day, so the Lord commanded to do farther, to make atonement for you" [Lev. viii. 34]. "To do farther" means the red cow; "to make atonement," the Day of Atonement.

The Boraitha according to Resh Lakish is as follows: Moses ascended in the cloud, was covered by the cloud, and was sanctified in the cloud, in order that he should have been able to receive the Torah for Israel in a state of sanctitude, as it is written [Ex. xxiv. 16]: "And the glory of the Lord abode upon the Mount Sinai." This occurred after the day in which the ten commandments were given, which was the first of the next forty days. So said R. Jose the Galilean. R. Aqiba, however, said: "'The Lord's glory abode,' that was the first day of the month (Sivan); 'the cloud covered it,' the mountain, not Moses (for during the six days the latter went from God to Israel and from Israel to God); 'and he called,' he called Moses himself. Although Moses and all Israel stood, yet to do honor to Moses, he called him alone." R. Nathan said: "To what purpose was Moses covered by the cloud six days? That the victuals in his bowels should be digested, so that he should be pure as the angels." R. Matthiah b. Heresh, however, said: "The entire separation was for the purpose of overawing him, that the Torah should be received with awe, shivering, and trembling, as it is written [Ps. ii. 11]: 'Serve the Lord with fear, and rejoice with trembling.'" What is meant by "rejoice with trembling"? Said R. Adda bar Matna in the name of Rabh: "Where there is joy, there should be awe."

On what point do R. Jose the Galilean and R. Aqiba differ?

They differ like the Tanaim of the following Boraitha: "On the sixth day of Sivan the Torah has been given to Israel; R. Jose, however, says, on the seventh." According to him who says that the Torah was given on the sixth day, Moses ascended on the seventh; according to him who says, on the seventh, he received the Torah and ascended on the seventh day, as it is written [Ex. xxix. 16]: "And he called unto Moses on the seventh day." R. Jose the Galilean holds with the first Tana, who maintains that the Torah was given on the sixth of the month; and therefore, he says, "the glory of the Lord abode" after the day on which the commandments had been given. The cloud covered Moses six days, and on the seventh he called him to receive the rest of the Law. But R. Aqiba holds, according to R. Jose, that the commandments were given on the seventh day, and that Moses ascended on the same day.

"And the Lord called unto Moses, and spoke unto him" [Lev. i. 1]. Why was it need to call first, and then to speak? The Torah teaches good manners, that a man should not communicate to another anything before he tells him that he wishes to speak to him. And this is in support of R. Hanina, who has said the same.

Said R. Menasseh the Great: How is it known, when one person communicates something to another, that one has no right to tell it to a third without permission? It is written [ibid.], "spoke unto him out of the tabernacle of the congregation, saying" (in Hebrew "Lemor," which is considered here as equivalent to "Lo Emor," not to speak). From the above saying of Resh Lakish to R. Johanan, that if you infer all this from the days of consecration, etc., we must assume that both agree that whatever is written concerning the days of consecration is obligatory. Now from what has been taught, that about the days of consecration R. Johanan and R. Hanina differed, one says, all that is written is obligatory, and the other, that only which is obligatory for later generations, but what is not obligatory for later generations was not obligatory even then. Infer that R. Johanan is the one who says that all that is written there is obligatory. For were the case otherwise, R. Johanan would have replied to Resh Lakish that it is not so.

In what consists the difference? Said R. Papa, in the separation for the seven days. According to him who says that all that is written there is obligatory, the removal of the high-priest for the seven days is obligatory (and if it was not done, his ser-

vice is invalid); according to the other opinion, this is not obligatory. But how is it known that in the second case this is not obligatory? Because it is written in the Mishna: "A substitute is prepared," and not "removed." What is the reason of him who says that all which is written is obligatory? Said R. Itz'hak bar Bisna: It is written [Ex. xxix. 35]: "And thou shalt do unto Aaron and to his sons, *thus*." *Thus* signifies that it is obligatory. This would be right in regard to all the things written in the chapter about the days of consecration; but whence is it known that other things not written in this chapter are also obligatory (*e.g.*, the breastplate and Ephod, not mentioned in that chapter, yet known to be obligatory)? Said R. Na'hman b. Itz'hak: We infer it from an analogy of expression; in that chapter the "door of the tabernacle of the congregation" is mentioned [Lev. viii. 4], and in the chapter about the breastplate, etc. [Ex. xxix. 4] the same expression recurs. (As in the case of practice it is obligatory, so in the case of the commandment.) R. Mesharshia says: It is inferred from "keep the charge of the Lord" [Lev. viii. 35] (an analogy of expression is not necessary, it is plainly said "keep," hence it is obligatory). R. Ashi says, from "for so I have been commanded" [ibid.]; hence it is obligatory.

How did Moses attire Aaron and his sons on the days of consecration? [That is, to understand the verses of the Bible; we wish to know it, although it does not concern us.] The sons of R. Hiya and R. Johanan differ. One party says he attired Aaron first, and the sons next; and the other, Aaron and his sons at the same time. Said Abayi: About the coats and the mitres they do not differ—namely, that Aaron was attired in them first, and the sons later; for both in speaking of the commandments and the practice Aaron is mentioned first [Ex. xxix. 56; Lev. viii. 7]. What they differ about is the girdle. The party who says, "Aaron, and his sons later," does so because it is written, "and girded *him* with the girdle" [Lev. viii. 7], and later, "girded *them* with girdles" [ibid. 13]. The party who says they were attired at the same time, do so because it is written, "Thou shalt gird them with girdles, Aaron and his children" [Ex. xxix. 9]. But how can it be said that he attired them at the same time (it is written plainly that first he attired Aaron, and then his sons)? There is a difference between a girdle of the high-priest and that of an ordinary priest. That means, when it is written he girdled Aaron first, it is meant,

TRACT YOMAH (DAY OF ATONEMENT). 7

with the girdle of the high-priest; but with the ordinary girdles he attired them all at once.

"*The high-priest is removed,*" etc. For what purpose was he removed? "For what purpose?" Has it not been said above, R. Johanan gave one reason, Resh Lakish another? We mean to ask, why had he to be removed from his home (he could practise at home)? Because it was learned in a Boraitha that R. Jehudah b. Bathyra said, it is apprehended lest he have intercourse with his wife, when there is doubt that she is in her sickness (then he would become unclean for the next seven days, and be unable to serve in the temple).

It was taught: The uncleanness contracted from a dead body is not considered in the case of an entire congregation, according to R. Na'hman. R. Shesheth, however, says, it is only postponed in that case. If there are individuals in the family of priests thus defiled, there is no difference of opinion that those individuals may *not* serve; but if the whole family was thus defiled, there is a difference of opinion between R. Na'hman and R. Shesheth. According to R. Na'hman, clean individuals of another family need not be sought because, where there is a congregation, the defilement is not considered at all. And according to R. Shesheth, who says it is only postponed, individuals of another family may be looked for. According to others, R. Na'hman says: Even the unclean individual also served, as in case of a congregation defilement is not taken into consideration. Said R. Shesheth: The authority for my decree is the following Boraitha: "If one stand sacrificing the Omer, and it become unclean in his hand, he shall so notify, and the congregation shall bring another in its stead. But if there is no other, he is told to have sense and to keep silent." Now we see that in the beginning it is said, another one should be brought in its stead; hence it is not permitted, but only postponed. Said R. Na'hman: I grant that, in a case in which the remains of the sacrifice must be eaten, when undefiled can be obtained, it is better.

On this point the Tanaim of the following Boraitha differed: "The golden plate [Ex. xxviii. 36] which is made for the high-priest, whether it is on his brow or not, it atones for all defilements of the offerings." So said R. Simeon; but R. Jehudah said, when it is on his brow it atones, but not otherwise. Said R. Simeon to him: The high-priest who serves on the Day of Atonement has not the plate on his brow, and nevertheless atones for all sins; hence we see that it atones even when not

on his brow. Answered R. Jehudah: Leave the high-priest on the Day of Atonement alone, for defilement is allowed to him when the whole congregation is defiled. Now, from R. Jehudah's answer that the defilement is allowed, we must conclude that R. Simeon holds that the defilement is only postponed, but not allowed.

Said Abayi: When the plate had been broken, all agree that it does not atone. They differ only when it is suspended on a peg. R. Jehudah says, because it is written [Ex. xxviii. 38], "it shall be upon Aaron's forehead, and Aaron shall atone," etc., (therefore) it only atones when it is on the brow. But R. Simeon's opinion is: Because it is said, "always they may be received in favor before the Lord" [ibid., ibid.]; and it cannot be said that it is meant that it should *always* be on his forehead, because he must satisfy human needs and sleep; hence we must say, it means that it always receives the Lord's favor. But what will R. Jehudah say to this "always"? He explains that it is meant, it should never be absent from his mind.

Shall we assume that the former Tanaim differ as the Tanaim of the following Boraitha: Both the high-priest and the priest that was to burn the red cow were sprinkled upon during the seven days with all the ashes that were there. So said R. Meir. R. Jose, however, said: He was sprinkled only on the third and on the seventh day. R. Hanina the Segan of the priests said: "The priest that was to burn the red cow used to be sprinkled on during all the seven days, but the high-priest was sprinkled only the third and seventh." Now, shall we assume that the point of difference is, because R. Meir says the defilement is only postponed in case of the congregation, and therefore he has to be sprinkled upon during the seven days, and R. Jose holds the defilement is not considered at all? (How can you say this? If R. Jose holds that the defilement is not considered, why the sprinkling at all on the third and the seventh?) Therefore we must say that all the Tanaim of this Boraitha hold that the defilement is only postponed, and not allowed, and the point on which they are at variance is this: R. Meir holds we compare the sprinkling to the bathing; as the bathing at the proper times is a religious duty, so also is the sprinkling. And R. Jose holds, we do not compare (the sprinkling to the bathing). Now, then, what is the opinion of R. Hanina the Segan? If we compare it to bathing, the high-priest has to be sprinkled also every day; and if not, why is the other priest of the red cow sprinkled every

day? He does not compare; only in case of the priest of the red cow it is an optional improvement. R. Jose b. R. Hanina opposes this: Why is he sprinkled on the fourth day? (The law is that one unclean must be sprinkled on the third day and on the seventh [Num. xix. 12]. The first three days it was apprehended lest each be the third or seventh (after his unintentional defilement), but the fourth after the removal from his house can neither be the third nor the seventh. Even without this, could he be sprinkled all the seven days? One of them must have been on Sabbath, and sprinkling does not supersede Sabbath? Therefore we must say that what is said of the seven days, is meant with the exception of Sabbath. The same is the case with the fourth; it is meant, all the seven days, except the fourth. Said Rabba: Therefore the high-priest must be removed seven days before the *Day of Atonement*, whose date is not dependent on us; but on the third day of the month,* he must be removed seven days before that day, no matter when the fourth day falls. But the priest of the red cow, the date of whose removal depends on us, should be removed on such a day that the fourth shall fall on Sabbath.

"To the Palhedrin Chamber." We have learned in a Boraitha: R. Jehudah said: Was it called the Palhedrin Chamber, it was called the Chamber of the Lords? He answers: Formerly it was called the Chamber of the Lords, but after the high-priests began to be appointed for money, and changed as government officers (Palhedrin, changed once in twelve months), it began to be called the Hall of the Palhedrin. What is meant by Palhedrin? Officers.

Rabba bar bar Hana in the name of R. Johanan said: It is written [in Proverbs x. 27]: "The fear of the Lord increases man's days, but the years of the wicked will be shortened." "The fear of the Lord increases the days"; that refers to the first Temple, during whose existence of four hundred and ten years there were only eighteen high-priests. "The years of the wicked will be shortened," refers to the second Temple, which existed four hundred and twenty years, and more than three hundred high-priests succeeded each other during that period. Subtract the forty years during which Simeon the Righteous ministered, eighty years of Johanan the high-priest's ministry, and ten years of Ishmael b. Favi—according to others, eleven

* The Day of Atonement always occurs on the tenth day of the month Tishri.

years of R. Eleazer b. Harsum—and compute, you will see that not even one high-priest completed his year.

R. Johanan b. Turtha said: Why had Shiloh fallen? Two sins were committed there: adultery and sacrilege. Adultery, as it is written [I Sam. ii. 22]: "Now Eli was very old, and heard all that his sons were in the habit of doing unto all Israel; and how they would lie with the women that assembled at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation." And sacrilege, as it is written [ibid. 17]: "And the sin of the young men was very great before the Lord; for the men despised the offering of the Lord."

Why has the first Temple fallen? Because there were three things: idolatry, adultery, and bloodshed. Idolatry, as it is written [Jerem. xxviii. 20]: "For the bed shall be too short for a man to stretch himself out on it; and the covering too narrow to wrap himself in." And R. Johanan said: The bed is too narrow that there should be two, God and the idols. [Said R. Samuel b. Nahmoni: When R. Jonathan used to come to this verse, he used to cry, saying: That the Lord, of whom it is said [Ps. xxxiii. 7], "He gathereth together like heaps the waters of the sea," should feel too little space because of an idol.] Adultery, as it is written [Is. iii. 16]: "Forasmuch as the daughters of Zion are fraud, and walk with stretched forth necks and casting about their eyes, walking and mincing as they go, and making a tinkling with their feet." R. Itz'hak said to this: What is meant by tinkling? They used to fill the shoes with spices, and when a young man was by, they pressed the spices with the feet, to attract his attention.

Bloodshed, as it is written [2 Kings xxi. 16]: "And also innocent blood did Manasseh shed in very great abundance."

But the second Temple, where the occupations were study of the Law, religious duties, and charity—why fell it? Because there was groundless enmity.* From this we can infer that unfounded hatred is equal to all the three sins together: idolatry, adultery, and bloodshed. In the time of the first Temple, although they were wicked, yet because they put their trust in the Holy One, blessed be He, as it is written [Micah iii. 11]: "Her heads judge for bribes, her priests teach for reward, and her prophets divine for money: and yet they will lean upon the

* In the Palestinian Talmud it is said: Because they loved money, and hated each other without grounds.

Lord, and say, Is not the Lord among us? evil cannot come over us." For this, the Holy One, blessed be He, brought on them three chastisements, for their three sins; as it is written [ibid. 14]: "Therefore for your sake shall Zion be ploughed up as a field, and Jerusalem shall become ruinous heaps, and the mount of the house, forest-covered high places."

R. Johanan and R. Elazar both said: In the time of the first Temple, as their sin was laid bare, therefore the date of the end of their suffering has likewise been revealed; but in the time of the second Temple, when their sin was not stated clearly in writing, therefore the date of the end (of their suffering) was not revealed either.

R. Johanan said again: The nail of those of the time of the first Temple was preferable to the belly (whole body) of those of the time of the second Temple. Said Resh Lakish to him: On the contrary, the last were better. Although they were subject to a foreign government, nevertheless they studied and observed the Law. Rejoined R. Johanan: The fact of the Temple can prove it. The first obtained the Temple once more, and the last have it not yet. R. Elazar was asked: Who were greater, the first or the second? He replied: Take the Temple as a sign.

Resh Lakish was bathing in the Jordan: Rabba bar bar Hana came to him, and shook hands with him. Resh Lakish said to him: God detests you Babylonians, as it is written [Solomon's Song viii. 9]: "If she be a wall, we will build upon her a palace of silver; and if she be a door, we will enclose her with the boards of cedar." That signifies thus: If you were all strong as a wall, and went all with Ezra, you would have been like silver, which can never rot; but as you did not, you were like wooden doors, which are subject to decay.

It is possible that Resh Lakish spoke with Rabba bar bar Hana? If with R. Elazar, who was the principal man in Palestine, Resh Lakish did not speak; because it was a rule that, with whomsoever Resh Lakish spoke in the street, money could be given to him without witnesses. Should Resh Lakish then have spoken with Rabba bar bar Hana (who was an inferior man)? Says R. Papa: Substitute another person. Either it was Resh Lakish and Z'eri, or R. Elazar and Rabba bar bar Hana. When the last came to R. Johanan and related to him what Resh Lakish had told him, he said: This is not the reason. If all had come with Ezra, even then the Shekhina would not have dwelt in the second Temple, since it is written [Gen. ix. 27]: "May

God enlarge the boundaries of Japheth, and may he dwell in the tents of Shem"; that signifies, that although God enlarges the boundaries of Japheth, his Shekhina can only dwell in the tents of Shem (*i.e.*, because the second Temple was under the rule of the Persians, who are of Japheth, the Shekhina could not dwell there, but only in Solomon's Temple, which was Shem's). And how is it known that the Persians are descendants of Japheth? Because it is written [Gen. x. 2]: "The sons of Japheth: Gomer, and Magog, and Madai, and Jabon, and Tubal, and Meshech, and Thirass"; and R. Joseph has taught, that Thirass is Persia.

R. Joshua b. Levi said in the name of Rabbi: A time will come, when those who have destroyed the second Temple will fall into the hands of the Persians. As it is written [Jerem. xlix. 20]: "Therefore hear the counsel of the Lord, that he hath resolved against Edom; and his purposes, that he hath devised against the inhabitants of Theman. Surely the least of the flocks shall drag them away: surely he will devastate their habitation." Rabba b. Ula opposed: How is it known that by the least of the flocks Persia is meant? Because it is written [Dan. viii. 20]: "The ram that thou hast seen, him with the two horns, signifies the kings of Media and Persia?" Perhaps Javan (the Greeks) are meant? As it is written [ibid. 21]: "And the shaggy he-goat is the king of Javan (Greece)." When R. Habiba b. Surmika went up to Palestine, he told to a scholar the objection of Rabba b. Ula. He said to him: A man who cannot explain the verses of the Bible should dare oppose Rabbi? What is meant by "the least of the flock"? the youngest of the brothers (that is, Thirass), and R. Joseph has said, Thirass is Persia.

Rabba bar bar Hana in the name of R. Johanan, quoting R. Jehudah b. Ilai, said: Those who have destroyed the second Temple will fall into the power of Persia. And this is an *a fortiori* reasoning: If the children of Shem, who built the first Temple, and the Chaldeans, who destroyed it, fell into the hands of the Persians, how much more the destroyers of the second Temple, which the Persians themselves have built, must fall into the power of the Persians. Rabh, however, said: On the contrary, it will come that Persia will succumb under those who have destroyed the Temple. Said R. Kahana and R. Assi to Rabh: Is it right that those who had built the Temple should fall under the dominion of those who have destroyed it? He answered: Yea, such is the decree of the King. R. Jehudah also said in the name of Rabh: The Messiah, descended from

David, will not arrive until Rome shall have dominated over the entire world nine months. As it is written [Micah v. 2]: "Therefore he will give them up until the time that she who travaileth hath brought forth"; and the end of the verse is, "then shall the remnant of his brethren return with the children of Israel."

The rabbis taught: All the chambers of the Temple had no Mezuzahs,* except the Chamber of Palhedrin, which was a dwelling of the high-priest. Said R. Jehudah: Were there not many chambers in the Temple which were dwellings, and nevertheless were without Mezuzahs? Therefore we must say that the Mezuzah in the Palhedrin Chamber was only as a precautionary measure (lest it be said of the high-priest that he was in prison, which requires no Mezuzah). What is the reason of R. Jehudah's opinion that no Mezuzahs need be in the chambers of the Temple, even those which are dwellings? Said Rabba: R. Jehudah holds that a house not made both for summer and winter is not considered a house requiring a Mezuzah. Abayi objected: Is it not written [Amos iii. 15]: "And I will smite the winter house together with the summer house" (hence each is called a house)? He answered: It is called "winter house" or "summer house," but not *house* alone. Abayi objected again: We have learned in Maasroth, III., 7: "In regard to the booths made for the Feast of Tabernacles, during that feast things are made obligatory by R. Jehudah, but not by the sages." And concerning this Mishna we have learned in a Boraitha: R. Jehudah makes obligatory in regard to them Erub, Mezuzah, and Tithes (hence we see even a booth is considered a house). But perhaps it will be said, this is only rabbinical, but not biblical? This would be right of Erub and Mezuzah, but about Tithes it cannot be said that R. Jehudah makes them obligatory only on rabbinical grounds, lest he will thus tithe grain which is to be tithed rabbinically for that which is to be tithed biblically, and this is forbidden.

Therefore said Rabha: During the whole year nobody differs from the opinion that the booth is exempt from these duties; they only disagree about the seven days of the feast. And the reason for the Sukka is one, and that for the chamber of the Temple is another. The reason for the Sukka is, because R. Jehudah is consistent with his theory that a Sukka must be a permanent dwelling; and a permanent dwelling requires a Mezu-

* See Deut. vi. 9.

zah. The rabbis are in accordance with their theory that a Sukka need be only a temporary dwelling, which requires no Mezuzah. And the reason for the chambers of the Temple is: The sages hold, a dwelling in which a person abides by compulsion is considered a dwelling-house; and R. Jehudah's opinion is, it is not considered so. Therefore biblically it is exempt from a Mezuzah; but the rabbis have ordered a Mezuzah to be made, lest it be said the high-priest is imprisoned.

Who is the Tana of the following Boraitha which the rabbis taught: "All gates which were in the Temple had no Mezuzahs, except the gate of Nicanor, next to (before) which was the Paledrin Chamber." Shall we assume that this is only according to the rabbis, and not according to R. Jehudah? For, if it were according to R. Jehudah, who thinks the Mezuzah in the chamber itself was only a precautionary measure, how could a Mezuzah be made on the gate; that would be a precautionary measure against a precautionary measure? Nay, that is all *one* precautionary measure.

The rabbis taught: What is written [Deut. vi. 9] "upon thy gates" applies to the gates of houses, courtyards, cities, and countries; all these are under the obligation of this religious duty towards God, as it is written: "And thou shalt write upon the doorposts of thy house, and upon thy gates." Said Abayi to R. Saphra: Why was no Mezuzah made on the city gate of Mechuzah (the majority of whose population were Jews)? Abayi replied: It was not made, because it would have been dangerous. (The government in its ignorance would say it was a charm.*)

As we have learned in the following Boraitha: A Mezuzah of an individual must be examined twice in a Sabbatical period (seven years, whether it is valid); and one of a congregation, twice in a jubilee (fifty years). And R. Jehudah said: It once happened a repairer examined a Mezuzah in the upper market of Ziporeth, and a quæstor surprised him doing this, and fined him a thousand Zuz. But did not R. Elazar say, that harm cannot befall a delegate for religious duties? In cases where harm is usually to be expected, it is different. As it is written [1 Sam. xvi. 2]: "And Samuel said: How shall I go? If Saul should hear it, he would kill me"; and the Lord said: "Take a heifer with thee; and say, To sacrifice unto the Lord am I come." (It

* In our *Philacterien-Ritus* we have explained this differently. The danger was that it should be recognized as a purely Jewish city and exposed to the Jews' enemies.

is therefore evident that in cases of certain danger, even a delegate for a religious duty has to fear.) R. Kahna taught before R. Jehudah: A house where straw, cattle, wood, or grain is kept, is exempt from a Mezuzah, because women wash themselves there. Said R. Jehudah to him: Is that the reason why these houses are exempt? And otherwise, it were not so? Have we not learned in a Boraitha, a stable is exempt from a Mezuzah in any event? What is meant is, that in spite of the fact that women make their toilet there, and they may be considered as dwellings, yet they are exempt from Mezuzahs. Rejoined R. Kahna: Is that so? We have learned in another Boraitha, a stable is exempt from a Mezuzah; but if the women make their toilet there, then a Mezuzah is obligatory? What canst thou answer, except that it is one of several different opinions of the Tana'im? So I can say, that what I have said about the reason of the women's washing themselves, is also one opinion of the Tana'im. R. Jehudah, however, holds that when it is not known that the women make their toilet there, all agree they are exempt.

R. Samuel b. R. Itz'hak taught in the presence of Rabba: Six kinds of gates are exempt from a Mezuzah: those of places where straw is kept, or cattle, wood, grain, or a Median (vaulted) gate, or a roofless gate, or one less than ten spans high. Thou hast said six, and hast enumerated seven? He answered: About the Median gate the opinions of the Tana'im are different.

The rabbis taught: "A prayer-house, a house belonging to a woman, and one belonging to two partners, must have a Mezuzah." Is not this self-evident? One might think, because it is written "in thy house," but not "in her house" or "in their house," such are exempt, he comes to teach us that it is not so. But whence do we deduce that it is not so? It is written [Deut. xi. 21]: "In order that your days may be multiplied, and the days of your children" (a Mezuzah is then useful to longevity; does not a woman wish to live long?). Why, then, is it written "thy house" (Bethcha)? It is according to Rabha, who said, it is equivalent to *Biathcha* (thy entering); as one enters the house with the right foot usually foremost, therefore the Mezuzah should be on the right side of the entrance.

"*Another high-priest is appointed,*" etc. It is certain that when the high-priest became unfit by some accident before the daily morning offering (on the Day of Atonement itself), the substitute was exercised in the service of the daily morning offering

(and made to be recognizable as the high-priest). But if the accident happened after the daily morning offering, how was it? (All the services were done in the four articles of dress of an ordinary priest, not in the garments of a high-priest). Said R. Ada bar Ahba: He was exercised in the girdle. (So that he was recognized to be the high-priest.) It is right, according to the Tana who says that the girdle of the high-priest did not differ from that of an ordinary priest; and on the Day of Atonement, as the high-priest's girdle was of byssus, he was identified as the high-priest, but according to him who says that the high-priest's girdle was different (and to girdle him with the high-priest's girdle, except during service, is forbidden), how then was he identified? Said Abayi: He attired himself in the eight articles of dress, and went with the basin, and turned over the sacrifice on the altar that it burn better. (This is considered a service, and he was thus exercised and recognized.) And that is according to R. Huna, who said: A layman who turns over the sacrifice is liable to capital punishment, because it is a service. R. Papa, however, said: His service is his exercise (no preparatory ones are necessary). Because, did not a Boraitha state that all the vessels Moses had made, were consecrated by their anointment? Who consecrated the vessels made later than the time of Moses? Their use for service consecrates them. So also here, his service is his exercise.

When Rabbin came from Palestine, he said: The girdle of the high-priest on the Day of Atonement was of byssus, according to all; during the whole year all agree it was of Kilaim (mixed of wool and linen). What they differ about is, whether a girdle of a common priest, during the whole year and on the Day of Atonement, was of Kilaim, as Rabbi says, or of byssus, as R. Eliezer b. R. Simeon says. Said R. Na'hman b. Itz'hak: We have also learned so in a Boraitha: It is written [Lev. vi. 3], "upon his flesh." Why is "put upon" necessary? This is to add, that when he removes the ashes he must have on the mitre and girdle also. Such is the decree of R. Jehudah. R. Dosa said: This is to add that the four garments of a high-priest on the Day of Atonement may be worn by a common priest. Said Rabbi: There are two objections to this. The first objection is, the girdle of a high-priest on the Day of Atonement is not the same as that of a common priest; and, secondly, how can it be said that the garments employed for a more important (?) holiness, may be used later for any less important. What else is

the phrase "put upon" to add? That he may use his old garments (and needs not new ones). R. Dosa, who prohibits old garments, except to common priests, decrees according to his theory in the following Boraitha: It is written [Lev. xvi. 23], "And he shall leave them there"; that signifies they must be hidden. R. Dosa, however, said: He may not use them himself the next year (on the Day of Atonement, but a common priest can use them).

The rabbis taught: When the high-priest happened to become unfit for service, and his substitute performed it, then after the Day of Atonement the high-priest resumes his service, and all the laws regarding the high-priesthood apply to the substitute (he can no longer be like a common priest). Such is the decree of R. Meir. R. Jose, however, says: The high-priest resumes his service, the substitute does not become like a high-priest, nor continues to be as a common priest. And R. Jose added: It happened to Joseph b. Alem of Ziporeth, that he was a substitute for the high-priest, who performed the service instead of the high-priest, to whom an accident had happened. Later the sages said, the high-priest should resume his service, and that Joseph b. Alem is fit no longer to be either a high-priest or a common priest. A high-priest, to prevent enmity; and a common priest, because there is a rule, in holiness one may increase but not decrease. Said Rabba bar bar Hana in the name of R. Johanan: The Halakha prevails according to R. Jose. R. Jose grants, that if the substitute *has* performed service in the Temple, this service is valid.

R. Jehudah said in the name of Rabh also: The Halakha prevails according to R. Jose, and R. Jose grants that when it happens the high-priest dies, he may become high-priest. This is self-evident? One might say, since he was his rival in life, he might not become a high-priest after his death. He comes to teach us it is not so.

"*R. Jehudah says, another wife,*" etc. The sages apprehend lest an accident happen to the high-priest himself, and prepare a substitute. Why not prepare another wife also? The rabbis can answer: An accident of defilement can happen, but death (which is rare) is not apprehended.

"*There will be no end,*" etc. The sages have given a good answer to R. Jehudah? R. Jehudah can reply: That one may die, is apprehended; that both should die, is not.

The rabbis taught: The high-priest may sacrifice when he is

an Onen (one of his relatives had died, and not been interred yet), but he may not eat (of the sacrifices). R. Jehudah says, the whole day. What is meant? Said Rabh: If he is in his home, he must be brought to the Temple to perform the service. Said Abayi to him: How canst thou say this? We know that, according to R. Jehudah, he is told to stop, even when he is performing the service, as we have learned in the following Boraitha: "When he stands sacrificing on the altar," and it is reported to him that one of his relatives is dead, he must interrupt the service, and go. So is the decree of R. Jehudah. R. Jose says: He must conclude the service, and then go. And thou sayest he is brought from his home. Therefore says Rahha: What is meant by "the whole day"? The whole day he is not obliged to perform the service, when he is an Onen, lest he eat of the sacrifices (but in the evening he may). Said R. Adda b. Ahba to Rabha: Does R. Jehudah take such a precautionary measure against his eating? Did we not learn in our Mishna, R. Jehudah said, another wife was prepared for him, lest his own wife die? If his wife die, he is expected to perform the service, and R. Jehudah does not take the precautionary measure lest he partake of the sacrifice? Rabha answered: What comparison is this? This is the Day of Atonement, when nobody eats; it is not feared that he shall eat. But on a common day it is apprehended.

MISHNA: During all the seven days he sprinkles the blood [of the daily offerings, to become practised], fumes the incense, trims the lamps, and offers the head and the leg. During all the other days, he sacrifices, if he chooses, since the high-priest offers the first portion as he prefers, and takes for his own use a portion of the first offering.

GEMARA: Who is the Tana who holds so? Said R. Hisda: That is not in accordance with R. Aqiba. For R. Aqiba holds that when a clean man is sprinkled upon, he thereby becomes defiled. And since the high-priest was sprinkled upon all the seven days, how could he perform the service? As we have learned in the following Boraitha: It is written [Num. xix. 19]: "And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean." Infer from this (since *unclean* is written, not *him*), that only an unclean person becomes clean; but if a clean person is sprinkled on, he becomes unclean. So is the decree of R. Aqiba. But the sages said: This only applies to things subject to defilement. Abayi, however, said: It may be said, the

Mishna can be even in accordance with R. Aqiba; and the case is, the whole day he can perform the service, in the evening he bathes, and when the sun has set, he becomes clean.

"Fumes the incense, and trims the lamps." From this we see that the rite of the incense is performed first, and after that, of the lamps. There is a contradiction? We have learned in Tamid, III., 6: "Who has got the privilege to clear the inner altar of the ashes, to trim the lamps and offer the incense" (hence we see, the lamps precede the incense). Said R. Johanan: The Tana who has taught the order of the rites on the Day of Atonement is R. Simeon, the man of Mitzpah, who differed from the sages of the Mishna in Tract Tamid.

And there is a contradiction even in this tract in the order of the rites, as we learn in a Mishna farther on. The second lot is to determine who should slaughter, who should sprinkle, who should clear the inner altar, who shall trim the lamps, and who shall carry up the members on the staircase. The third lot is drawn by nine priests, to determine who should offer the incense. (Hence the lamps here precede the incense also.) Said Abayi: It presents no difficulty. In the one case the two lamps are meant, in the other case the five lamps. (Shall we assume that between the trimming of the two lamps and the five lamps incense was offered?) Did not Abayi, who ordered the rites according to a tradition, say that between the trimming of the two and five lamps the blood of the daily sacrifice was sprinkled? We can say, it presents no difficulty. This is according to R. Abbu Saul, and according to the sages of the following Boraitha: One shall not trim the lamps, and then offer the incense; but he must first offer the incense, and then trim the lamps. Abbu Saul, however, said: He must first trim the lamps, and then offer the incense. What is the reason of Abbu Saul's decree? It is written [Ex. xxx. 7]: "Every morning, when he dresseth the lamps," (and later) "shall he burn it." What will the sages say to this? The sages say, at the same time both should be done, not that the lamps should be before the incense. For if you should not say so, how will the next verse be explained: "And when Aaron lighteth the lamps toward evening, shall he burn it" [ibid. 8]? He should first light, and then offer the incense later? And if you would say that so it is, did we not learn in a Boraitha, it is written, "from the evening to the morning" [Ex. xxvii. 21]? There is no service which is valid from the evening till the morning except this. (Hence we see

the lamps were the last.) (We must therefore say that) the Torah means, that at the same time the lamps are lighted, the incense is to be offered. So also is it with the cleaning of the lamps; when they are cleaned, the morning incense is offered. R. Papa said: The self-contradiction of this tract presents no difficulty, because one decree is according to the rabbis, and one according to Abbu Saul. What did R. Papa mean to say: He wants to ascribe our Mishna to the rabbis, and that speaking of the lots to Abbu Saul. Let us see how the end of that Mishna in Chap. III., namely, "went in to fume the morning incense, and to trim the lamps," will correspond. This is certainly according to the rabbis. Then the first part and the conclusion of the Mishna will be according to the rabbis, and the middle part according to Abbu Saul? R. Papa can say, that this is the case.

In the Mishna in Tamid we have learned: When he comes to the northeastern corners of the altar, he places the blood there, and when he comes to the southwestern corners, he places the blood there. And in addition to this, we have learned in a Boraitha: "That R. Simeon, the man of Mitzpah, makes a difference in the daily offering; namely, when he comes to the northeastern corners, he places the blood on both corners at once, but at the southwestern he first places it on the western corner, then on the southern." What is the reason of R. Simeon? Said R. Johanan in the name of one disciple of the school of R. Janai: Because it is written [Num. xxviii. 15]: "One he-goat for a sin-offering unto the Lord, besides the continual burnt-offering, shall it be prepared with its drink-offering." What is the sin-offering mentioned for, in connection with the burnt-offering? To teach us that though it is a burnt-offering, in one respect it must be sacrificed as a sin-offering; namely, at two of the four corners he places the blood on both corners at once as a burnt-offering, and at the southwestern he puts the blood on the western first, and on the southern thereafter.

We have learned in another Mishna (Tamid, III., 3): "The superintendent said to them, Go and bring a lamb from the chamber of the lambs." The chamber of the lambs was in the northwestern corner (of the house of heating). Such an apartment existed in the temple, to render the marble pavement of the temple warm, on which the priest had to walk barefooted).

There were four chambers: one that of the lambs, one that of the seals, one that of the heating house, and one chamber

where the showbread was made. There is a contradiction to the Mishna in Midoth (I., 7): "Four chambers were in the heating house, like small rooms opening into a great hall: two belonged to the sanctuary, and two were profane; and small wickets parted the sacred ones from the profane ones. And what was their use? The southwestern was for the lambs for the sacrifices. The southeastern was that in which the showbread was made. In the northeastern the Maccabees (Hasmoneans) had hidden the stones of the altar profaned by the Greeks. The northwestern was used as a passage to the bath-house." (There is, then, a contradiction between the two about the names and use of the chambers and situation of the chamber of lambs?) Said R. Huna: The Tana according to whom is the Mishna in Tract Midoth is R. Eliezer b. Jacob, as we have learned (*ibid.* II., 5): The chamber at the northeast was the place where wood was kept, and the blemished priests examined the wood there, as mouldy wood was unfit for the altar. The northwestern chamber was the place of the cured lepers (who came to the Temple to be sprinkled to sacrifice). The southwestern? Says R. Eliezer b. Jacob: I forget what its use was. Abbu Saul says: Wine and oil for the offerings were kept there, and it was called the chamber of oil. Hence we see the Mishna in Midoth must be in accordance with R. Eliezer b. Jacob. And so it also seems from another Mishna in Midoth (IV.). R. Addi b. Abba said: Our Mishna is in accordance with R. Jehudah of the following Boraitha: R. Jehudah said: The altar stood in the middle of the court, and was in size thirty-two ells, ten ells opposite to the door of the Temple (wide twenty ells), eleven ells toward the north, and eleven ells to the south: so that the altar was opposite to the Temple and to its walls. Now, if you would say that the Mishna in Midoth is according to R. Jehudah, how can it be that the altar should be in the middle of the court? R. Addi the son of R. Itz'hak said: The chamber of the lambs was at the western side, and extended toward both the north and southwestern corners; and to him who came from the southern side it seemed to be the north, while to one who came from the north it seemed in the southern corner (but in reality it was in the southwestern).

"*The high-priest offers the first portion,*" etc. The rabbis taught: What is meant by his offering a portion the first? He may say what burnt-offering or meal-offering he wants to offer (and no other priest may touch it). And what is meant by his

taking a portion the first? He may say of which sin-offering or trespass-offering he desires to partake. And he can take one of the two loaves. He can also take four or five of the loaves of the showbread. Rabbi said: He always took five loaves, because it is written [Lev. xxiv. 9]: "And it shall belong to Aaron and to his sons." We interpret it thus: Half should belong to Aaron (or the high-priest) and half to the children of Aaron (priests). Does not this Boraitha contradict itself? First it is said, he takes one of the two loaves—that means, the half—and this is according to Rabbi, who maintains that the high-priest always takes the half. Now the middle part, which says that he takes four or five, must be according to the rabbis, who say he does not take the exact half; and in the conclusion it is said, Rabbi says he always takes five. It seems, then, that the first part and conclusion are according to Rabbi, and the middle part according to the sages? Said Abayi: The first part and the middle part are according to the rabbis, but they admit that out of two loaves the high-priest could not but receive one, as it was not becoming to give him half a loaf.

MISHNA: He is attended by some elders of the Beth Din, who read to him [out of Lev. xvi.] concerning the ceremonial of the day (of Atonement), and say to him: My lord the high-priest, say it aloud, lest thou hast forgotten, or not studied this. On the morning of the day preceding the Day of Atonement, he is placed at the eastern gate, and bulls, rams, and sheep are passed before him, that he should get a knowledge of the service.

During all the seven days he is free to eat and drink, but on the eve of the Day of Atonement, at dusk, he is not permitted to eat much, as it would induce drowsiness.

GEMARA: It is right that they should say to him, Perhaps thou hast forgotten. But that they should say to him, Perhaps thou hast not studied, is an ignorant man made a high-priest? Have we not learned in a Boraitha: It is written [Lev. xxi. 10]: "And the priest that is highest of his brethren." That signifies, that he must be highest among his brethren in physical strength, in personal beauty, in wisdom, and in wealth.

An anonymous teacher said: Whence do we know that, if he is not rich, his brethren the priests must make him rich? Because it is written: "That is highest of his brethren," that signifies, his brethren must contribute to make him highest.

Said R. Joseph: It presents no difficulty. That was the case

during the time of the first Temple, and this in the time of the second Temple. As R. Assi said: A whole measure of dinars, Martha daughter of Bithas gave to the king Janai, that he should make Joshua b. Gamla high-priest.

"On the morning of the day preceding the Day of Atonement." We have learned a Boraitha: The he-goats were also passed before him. But why does not our Mishna mention it? Because (it holds that they were not passed), as the he-goats are only for the atonement of sin, he would have become dejected. If so, why were the bullocks passed, they are also for sins? Because the bulls were to atone for his sins and those of the priests, his brethren; he would not have become dispirited, because if they had sinned, he would have been told, and he would have induced them to repent. But the he-goats were to atone for the sins of all Israel: so he could not know who had sinned. Said Rabhina: This is what people say. Even if your sister's son is a (publican), you should not pass him in the street, for, since he knows your affairs, he will take from you more than from others.

"During all the seven days," etc. We have learned in a Boraitha: R. Jehudah b. Naqusa said: They gave to him to eat bread of the best flour, and eggs that it should be digested more easily (that he should not find himself compelled to interrupt his service on the Day of Atonement for a human necessity). The sages said to him: This heats yet more. We have learned in a Boraitha: Symmachos said: They gave him as food no citron, no eggs, no old wine. According to others, he received no citron, no eggs, no fat meat, no old wine. Still others say: Even white wine he did not receive, because white wine brings a man to uncleanness.

MISHNA: The Elders of the Beth Din left him to the attendance of the Elders of the priesthood, who took him up to the house of Abtinas, made him swear, took farewell, and went away. They said: My lord the high-priest, we are delegates of the Beth Din, and thou art our delegate and the delegate of the Beth Din; we conjure thee by Him who has made His abode in this house, that thou shalt not alter one thing about which we have spoken to thee. He took farewell weeping, and they parted weeping.

If he was a teacher, he lectured; otherwise, the scholars lectured before him. If he was practised in reading, he reads; if not, they read to him. From which books of the Scriptures?

From Job, Ezra, and Chronicles. Zechariah b. Kabutal says: Many times I read to him out of Daniel.

GEMARA: We have learned in a Boraitha: Teaching him the service consisted in teaching him to take a handful of incense (which had neither to be spilled nor any left on the top of the hand). R. Papa said: The high-priest had two chambers, one that of Palhedrin, to sleep in, the other that of Abtinas, to learn the service. One was in the north, one in the south. One in the north, as we have learned in Midoth (V., 3): Six chambers were in the court: three in the north, three in the south. Those of the south were the chambers of salt, of Parva, and that where the entrails were washed. The chamber of the salt was where the salt was kept for the sacrifices; that of Parva, where the skins of the sacrifices of the sanctuary were salted, and on its roof was a bath-house for the high-priest on the Day of Atonement. The washing chamber was where the entrails of the sacrifices of the sanctuary were washed. Thence a stone staircase led to the roof of the chamber of Parva. The three in the north were: a chamber for wood, the chamber of Exile, and the chamber of Gazith (hewn marble stones).

About that of wood, said R. Eliezer b. Jacob, I forget for what purpose it was used. Abbu Saul says, the chamber of the high-priest was behind the first two of the above-mentioned ones; the roofs of them all were on the same level. In the chamber of Exile there was a well, which those returned from the Exile had dug; over it was a wheel, whereby water was drawn, to supply the whole Temple. In the chamber of Gazith the Sanhedrin of Israel held session, and examined there the priests. Whatever priest was found to be legally unfit for service, used to dress himself in black clothes, enveloped himself in black, and went away. If he was found fit, he would dress himself in white, envelope himself in white, and enter the Temple to serve with his brethren. One other chamber was in the south, as we have learned in the following Mishna (Midoth V., 4): Seven gates were in the court: three at the north, three at the south, and one at the east. The south one was the Gate of Illumination, the other the Gate of the Sacrifices, the third the Gate of Water. At the east was the Gate of Nicenor; to this gate were adjoined two chambers, one at the right and one at the left. One was the chamber of Pin'has, the superintendent of the priests' wardrobe; the other was where barrels were manufactured. At the north was the Gate of Nitzutz. There was

a balcony and an attic over it, where priests were watching (the Temple) above, and the Levites beneath. Inside was the Choyl (a round walled and roofed place, in the Temple). The other was the Gate of Sacrifices. The third was the Gate of the Heating House, and we have learned in another Boraitha that on that day the high-priest took five legal bathings, and ten times sanctified his hands and feet from the laver. [See Ex. xxx. 18.] Both the bathing and the sanctifications he performed on the roof of the chamber of Parva, in the sanctuary, except the first one, which he did not take in the sanctuary, but near the Gate of Water. The bath-house was on one side of his chamber, only I don't know whether the Chamber of Palhedrin was in the north and that of Abtinas in the south, or *vice versa*.

"Thou art our delegate." Shall we assume that in this Mishna is found an objection to R. Huna b. R. Joshua, who said that the priests are delegates of the Merciful One (not of Beth Din)? If they were our delegates, then are there things which we ourselves may not do, and our delegates may (as in the case with the priests)? They did not say to the high-priest that he is their delegate, but that they conjured him to act according to their opinion and to that of Beth Din.

"He wept, and they wept." He wept for being suspected of being a Sadducee, and they wept because they probably suspected an innocent man, as R. Joshua b. Levi said: "He who suspects an upright man is smitten by God in his body." (See Sabbath, p. 191.) Why had he to be conjured? It was feared lest he prepare the incense on the censer outside of the Holy of Holies, and then enter with the censer, as did the Sadducees. The rabbis taught: It happened to one Sadducee, who prepared outside, and entered the Holy of Holies with it, when he came out, he was rejoicing greatly. When his father met him, he said to him: My son, though we are Sadducees, yet we must fear the Pharisees. He replied: All my years I was anxious to fulfil the verse [Lev. xvi. 2], "For in the cloud will I appear upon the mercy seat," and I said to myself, When will come the day when I might do it? And to-day, when I have had opportunity, should I not have done it? It was said, it did not take long before he died, and lay amidst rubbish, and worms crept out of his nose.

"Zechariah b. Kabutal," etc. R. Hanan b. Rabha taught to Hiya the son of Rabh in the presence of Rabh: Said R. Zechariah b. Kavatal: Rabh made to him a sign with the hand that he

should say Kabutal. Why did he not say it to him? Rabh read Sh'ma' at that time. Is it permitted to make signs when Sh'ma' is read? Did not R. Itz'hak b. Samuel b. Martha say: He who reads Sh'ma' must not wink his eyes, whistle with his lips, nor make signs with his fingers? And in a Boraitha we have also learned: R. Eliezer Hasma has said: He who reads Sh'ma', and winks, or whistles, or makes signs with his fingers, of him the verse says [Isaiah xlivi. 22]: "On me hast thou not called, Jacob." It presents no difficulty; in the first part of the Sh'ma' one may not do so, but during the recital of the second one may.

MISHNA: If he began to slumber, the young priests snapped with their fingers Tzreda, addressing him: My lord the high-priest, rise, and cool thyself once on the [marble] floor. He was kept occupied until the time for slaughtering the daily offering.

GEMARA: What is meant by the word Tzreda? Said R. Jehudah, the thumb. R. Huna showed this performance, and the sound went to all ends of the college.

"*Cool thyself once on the floor.*" Said R. Itz'hak: They said to him, show to us Kidah (supported only on his thumbs and great toes, to kiss the floor).

"*Until the time for slaughtering.*" We have learned in a Boraitha: He was not occupied by a violin or harp, but by voices: they sang to him. What? From Psalm cxvii.: "Unless the Lord do build a house, in vain labor they that build it." The respectable men of Jerusalem forbore to sleep the whole night, and talked among themselves, that the high-priest might hear the sound of voices, and not fall asleep. We have learned in a Boraitha: Abbu Saul says: Even in the countries where the temple was hot, they did it, in honor of the temple, but they came to sin on these occasions. Said Abayi, according to others, R. Na'hman b. Itz'hak: By what Abbu Saul said of the other countries, he meant Nahardea. Elijah said to R. Jehudah, the brother of R. Sala the Pious: You think to yourselves why Messiah does not come. To-day is the Day of Atonement, and many virgins have been lain with to-day in the City of Nahardea. Said to him R. Jehudah; What says the Holy One, blessed be He, to this? Elijah replied: He said in reference to this the verse in Genesis [iv. 7]: "Sin lieth at the door." He asked: What says Satan to this? Elijah answered: On the Day of Atonement he has no right to bring forward accusations.

MISHNA: Every day the altar is cleared of the ashes at the time of the crowing of the Geber (cock), a little while before or after it; but on the Day of Atonement it is done soon after midnight, and on the other holidays after the first watch of the night. And before the cock's crowing the fore court used to be filled with Israelites.

GEMARA: What is meant by Geber? Said Rabh, a *man* (*Geber* signifies "man" also). But the disciples of R. Shila say, a cock. It happened once, that Rabh was at the place where R. Shila was the chief of the college. R. Shila had no interpreter (as he lectured). Rabh assumed the function of his interpreter. When they came to this Mishna, "the cock's crowing," Rabh interpreted, "man's heralding." Said to him R. Shila: Let the Master say, "the cock's crowing." Rabh answered: A song good for educated men is not good for tanners. I have interpreted it thus for R. Hiya; he did not censure me, and you it does not please. Said R. Shila: Is the Master Rabh? Then, leave off. It is not fit that you should be my interpreter (sit on my chair, and I will interpret for you)? Rabh replied: The world says, If one has hired himself to a man, even if he tells him to brush wool (a work only for women) he should do it. According to others, he answered to him: In matters of holiness one increases, but does not decrease.

We have learned in one Boraitha according to Rabh, and in another according to R. Shila. We have learned according to Rabh: Gabini the Herald used to herald: Rise, priests, to your service; and Levites, to your chanting; and Israel, to your standing.* And his voice was heard at the distance of three *parsaoth*. It happened once that Agrippa the king being on the road, he heard Gabini's voice at the distance of three *parsaoth*. When he returned home, he sent him presents. Nevertheless, the voice of the high-priest surpassed in strength that of Gabini the Herald. Because the Master said, when he used to say on the Day of Atonement, "I pray Thee, O Lord," his voice was heard at Jericho, and Rabba bar bar Hana said in the name of R. Johanan: Between Jericho and Jerusalem is the distance of ten *parsaoth*, and although on the Day of Atonement one is weak from fasting, and though his voice was heard by day, whereas Gabini heralded only by night.

And we have learned in a Boraitha according to R. Shila: "He

* See Shekalim.

who walks on the road before the "Kriath Hageber" (cock's crowing), his blood is on his head. R. Joshiah says: Before the second cock's crowing. And according to others, before he crows the third time. Of what sort of cock is this said? Of a moderate cock (not a hasty or tardy one). R. Jehudah in the name of Rabh said: "When Israel used to come on the three pilgrimages, they stood crowded. But when they prostrated themselves, they had much space, and stationed themselves eleven ells behind the mercy-seat." What does he mean? Although they were eleven ells behind the mercy-seat, and were crowded, yet when they prostrated themselves they had much room, and this was one of the ten miracles that occurred in the Temple. (See Aboth, V., 2.)

Were there only ten miracles? Did not R. Ushia say that when Solomon built the Temple, he planted there all kinds of golden fruit-trees, and they bore fruits at the proper times, and when the wind blew on them, they fell down and were ripe? As it is written in Psalm lxxii. 16: "Its fruits shall shake like the trees of Lebanon." And when the Gentiles had entered the Temple, the fruit-trees became withered (blighted), as it is written [Nahum i. 4]: "The flowers of Lebanon wither," and the Holy One, blessed be He, will restore them. As it is written [Is. xxxi. 2]: "It shall blossom abundantly and rejoice; yea, with joy and singing, the glory of the Lebanon shall be given unto it." (So we see there were miracles besides the ten?) In the Mishna are counted only the perpetual miracles, but those happening on certain times only have not been reckoned.

The Master says elsewhere that in Jerusalem were two perpetual miracles: the rain never extinguished the fire on the outer altar, and the smoke was always straight in spite of the winds, in whichever directions they might blow. But we have learned in a Boraitha: Five things have been said of the fire on the *altar*: It had the form of a lion, it was clear as the sun, it was palpable, it consumed moist things as dry ones, and never emitted any smoke. (There is, then, a contradiction, since there was no smoke at all?) The smoke was that of the fire kindled by men. As we have learned in a Boraitha: It is written [Lev. i. 7]: "And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar." Infer from this, that although the fire descended from heaven, it was a merit to kindle an earthly fire also. (There is another contradiction?) You say it had the form of a lion. We have learned in a Boraitha, R. Hanina the Segan of

the priests said : I have seen it, and it had the form of a dog ? It presents no difficulty : in the time of the first Temple it was like a lion, and of the second, like a dog.

But in the second Temple there was no heavenly fire at all, as R. Samuel b. Inia said : It is written [Haggai i. 8] : " That I may take pleasure in it, and be glorified "; it is written " Veikabed," and it is read " Veikabdah." Why is the " h " missing ? This is to hint that five (the numeral value of " h ") things were missing in the second Temple. What are they ? The ark, the mercy-seat, the cherubim, the heavenly fire, the Shekhina, the Holy Spirit, and the Urim and Tumim. So we see there was no heavenly fire in the second Temple at all ? We may say, it was there, only it did not assist in consuming.

It is said above, that no wind could divert the smoke. But this is not so ? Did not R. Itz'hak b. Abdimi say : At the expiration of the Feast of Tabernacles, all looked on the smoke of the *altar* : when it was inclined to the north, the poor rejoiced, and the wealthier were dejected, for it showed there would be too much rain, and the fruit would rot: but when it was inclined to the south, the poor were out of spirits, and the rich were glad, for this was a sign there would be little rain, and the fruit would remain well-preserved, and fetch a high price. When it was bent eastward, all rejoiced, and westward, all were deplored it (thus we see that the smoke was swayed by the wind ?). It was made by the wind oblique, but not crooked.

CHAPTER II.

CONCERNING THE LOTS THE PRIESTS DREW, WHAT PRIESTS SHOULD GO TO THE ALTAR, AND HOW MANY PRIESTS WERE NEEDED FOR EACH SACRIFICE.

MISHNA: Formerly, whoever desired to clear the altar of the ashes did so. When there were many of them (priests), they ran on the staircase (leading to the top of altar). Whoever first came within four ells, merited it. When two were on a par, the superintendent said to them (all priests): Put forth your fingers. Which did they put forth? One or two, but not the thumb in the Temple (which were counted instead of the persons they belonged to, and the service was given to the last).

Once an accident happened: one of two who were running up the staircase pushed his companion, so that he fell, and broke his foot. Seeing that it is attended by accidents, the Beth Din made the reform, that the altar should be cleared by lot. There were four lots: this is the first lot.

GEMARA: Why had not lots been used formerly? Previously it was thought that since it is done by night and not considered an important service by the priests, they would not come in considerable number, but when it was seen that the case was otherwise, this reform was made.

Was this reform only for this purpose? We know that he who cleared the ashes also arranged the pieces of wood on the altar, and brought the two measures of wood, and that was considered an important service? Said R. Ashi: Two reforms were made: at first, when it had been thought they would not come in considerable numbers, no lot was used at all; then, when it was observed that they came and accidents happened, the use of the lot was introduced. Then the priests ceased to come, since they were not sure of drawing the lot at all. It was then reformed, that he who clears the ashes should arrange the pieces of wood and bring the two measures also, that the priests might come to draw the lot, since it would be for important services.

"*Put forth your fingers.*" We have learned in a Boraitha:

"He said to them thus. Put out your fingers, that they be counted." Why did he not count the persons themselves? This can be a support to what R. Itz'hak has said: "Israel must not be counted, even for religious duties." As it is written [1 Sam. xv. 4]: "And Saul ordered the people to assemble, and he numbered them by means of lambs."^{*} Said R. Elazar: Whoever numbers Israel, trespasses a negative commandment, because it is written [Hosea ii. 1]: "Yet shall the number of the children of Israel be like the sand of the sea, which may not be numbered." R. Na'hman b. Itz'hak says: He trespasses two commandments, as it is written, which cannot be measured nor numbered. R. Samuel b. Na'hman, in the name of R. Jonathan, found a contradiction in the same passage: It is written that the number of Israel will be like that of the sand (then a definite number is given), and then it is said, it cannot be counted—that is, has no number. It presents no difficulty: When Israel shall do the will of God, they will be without number; but when they do not do God's will, they will be of a definite number. Rabbi in the name of Abbi Joseph b. Dustai says: There is no contradiction in it. Men cannot count the sand, but in Heaven they can count it.

R. Huna said: How secure and careless should the man feel that knows that the Lord helps him: Saul committed only one sin; he lost his royalty: David committed two sins, and yet retained it. Saul's sin was, that he spared Agag. But he massacred the priests of Nob? That which is written [1 Sam. xv. 11], "I repent that I have set up Saul as king," was said already on the occasion of the sin of Agag [which was the first, chronologically]. What are David's two sins? That of Uriah and his numbering of Israel. But there is a third one? That of Bath-Sheba? For that of Bath-Sheba he was punished, as it is written [2 Sam. xii. 6]: "For the ewe he shall pay fourfold." What were the four punishments? The death of Bath-Sheba's child, the death of Amnon, the misfortune of Tamar, and Absalom. But for numbering Israel he was also chastised? As it is written [2 Sam. xxiv. 15]: "And the Lord sent a pestilence in Israel from the morning even to the time appointed." In that case all Israel was chastised, but not he himself. But in those instances it was also his children on whom the wrath was visited, not on

* The Talmud translates *Telaim* lambs, but the ordinary versions regard it as a proper name.

himself? Nay, he was personally punished, too. As R. Jehudah says in the name of Rabh: For six months David became leprous, and the Sanhedrin separated themselves from him, and the Shekhina. As it is written [Ps. cxix. 79]: "Let those that fear thee return unto me, and those that know thy testimonies." And it is written [ibid. li. 14]: "Restore unto me the gladness of thy salvation." (The first refers to the Sanhedrin, and the second to the Shekhina.) But did not David also believe calumnies? (of Ziba). For this he was also punished, for R. Jehudah said in the name of Rabh, when David said to Mephibosheth [2 Sam. xix. 30], "I have said, Thou and Ziba shall divide the field," a heavenly voice was heard, proclaiming that Rehoboam and Jeroboam should divide the kingdom.

It is written [1 Sam. xii. 1]: "One year old was Saul in his reign."^{*} Said R. Huna: That means, he was innocent of sin as a child of one year. R. Jehudah said in the name of Samuel: Why did not Saul's dynasty last long? Because there was no stain on his whole family. And R. Johanan in the name of R. Simeon b. Jehozadak said: A man must not be made the head of a congregation unless he has a whole heap of reptiles (family disgraces) at his back, in order that, if he should become haughty, people should be able to say to him: Look around, behind your back. R. Jehudah in the name of Rabh said: Why was Saul punished? Because he was willing to dispense with honors. As it is written [1 Sam. x. 27]: "But the worthless men said, in what can this one help us? And they despised him, and brought him no presents. But he acted as though he were deaf." And soon after this is written: "Then came up Nachash the Ammonite," etc.

R. Johanan in the name of R. Simeon b. Jehozadak said again: A scholar who is not revengeful and remembers not injuries as a serpent, cannot be called "Talmud Hakham" (a teacher). But it is written [Lev. xix. 18]: "Thou shalt not avenge nor bear any grudge"? There precautionary matters are spoken of (but in regard to bodily pain or honor it is different). As we have learned in the following Boraitha: "What is called revenge, and what is called bearing a grudge? Revenge is such a case: When one comes to the other, and asks him to lend a sickle to him, he says: Nay. On the morrow, the second comes to the first, and wants to borrow an axe. He answers:

* Literally it is thus, but translators have it, "When he had reigned one year."

I do not wish to lend to you, as you have not lent to me. This is called revenge. What is bearing a grudge? When one comes to another, and asks him to loan him an axe, and does not get it. On the morrow the second comes to the first, and wants to borrow a shirt. He answers: I lend it to you, because I am not like you, who did not want to lend me yesterday. This is called bearing a grudge." But in case of bodily pain, has not the Torah forbidden vengeance? Have we not learned in the following Boraitha: "Those who are wronged and not wronging, bear their shame and do not reply, do good deeds out of love, and rejoice not at afflictions, of them says the verse [Judges v. 31]: 'Those that love him are as the rising sun in his might.'"

Reply they should not, bear a grudge in their hearts they may (and if *another* party avenges them, they need not interfere). Is that so? Did not Rabha say: He who leaves his injuries unavenged, will have his sins forgiven in Heaven? That means, if the offender comes to propitiate him, he should pardon.

"*Which? One, or two?*" If two, why is it said at all, one (or two)? This applies to those who have a disease, that they cannot stretch forth one finger, without stretching out the other also. We have learned in the following Boraitha: They used to put out one finger when healthy, but when diseased, they could stretch out two.

"*Once an accident,*" etc. The rabbis taught: It once happened two priests were running, and were on a par. When they came to the top, one outstripped the other by four ells; he took a knife and stuck it into the other one's breast. R. Zadok stood on the staircase of the porch, and said: Brethren of Israel, hear! It is written [Deut. xxi. 1]: "If there be found a slain person in the land . . . shall take a heifer." For whom shall we bring the heifer? For the city, or for the Temple? The whole people began to weep. Then the father of the young man arrived, and found him yet agonizing. He said: "May he (the dead) be an atonement for your sins; and as he shows yet signs of life, the knife has not become unclean (since he still lived)." We may infer from this, that the defilement of the knife was considered by them as a yet greater misfortune than bloodshed.

The rabbis taught: It is written [Lev. vi. 4]: "He shall put off his garments, and put on other garments, and carry forth the ashes." We might think that, as on the Day of Atonement, he should strip himself of his holy garments and put on profane

garments, for removing the ashes. Therefore it is written in both cases "garments," that from the analogy of expression we should understand that both are holy garments. And by "other," older ones are meant. R. Eliezer, however, said: From the expression "other garments, and carry forth," we can infer that even a blemished priest may carry forth the ashes. Said Resh Lakish: As R. Eliezer and the first Tana differ about the carrying forth of ashes, so do they differ about the lifting up of the ashes from the altar. R. Johanan, however, said: They differ only about the carrying forth of the ashes, but about the lifting up all agree that it is a respectable service, which only an unblemished priest may perform. What is the reason of Resh Lakish, who says they differ on this point too? The reason of Resh Lakish is: If it were a real service, could it be performed only in two garments [ibid. 3]? And what will R. Johanan say to this? He says: The Torah only specifies these two, but all four are meant.

Rabh said: For performing the following four services a layman deserves capital punishment: namely, sprinkling, offering of incense, officiating at the water-offering and the wine-offering. And so also Levi taught in his Boraitha; also as to the lifting of the ashes. What is the reason of Rabh's decree? Because it is written [Num. xviii. 7]: "And thou and thy sons with thee shall keep your priesthood concerning every matter of the altar, and for that within the vail, where ye shall serve; as a service of gift do I give you your priesthood; and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death." Service of gift, but not of removing. Levi says: It is written, "Every matter of the altar," which includes all things. Rabha propounded a question: How about a service of removing from an altar in the Temple (inner)? Is this considered by Rabh like a service of gift, or like a service of removal? Rabha decided later, it is written [ibid.], "and for that within the vail"; but it is written, "and within the vail": that makes the service like to a service of removing. We have learned in one Boraitha according to Rabh, and in another according to Levi. According to Rabh we have learned as follows: "The services for which the layman is guilty of death are: Sprinkling of blood, inside or in the Holy of Holies (on the Day of Atonement); sprinkling the blood of a sin-offering of a bird; wringing-out of a bird's blood which is a burnt-offering [Lev. i. 15]; and officiating at the offering of three *lugs* of water or three lugs of wine." We

have learned according to Levi as follows: "The services for which a layman is guilty of capital punishment are: Removing the ashes; performing the seven sprinklings within, and on a leper; and offering on the altar something either fit or unfit."

Wherefore was the drawing of lots repeated? Said R. Johanan: To cause more excitement in the Temple, as it is written [Ps. xv. 15]: "So that we took sweet secret counsel together, and walked unto the house of God in a great company."

In what garments were the lots drawn? R. Na'hman says, in ordinary garments; R. Shesheth says, in holy ones. R. Na'hman says, in ordinary clothes, because some of the priests being strong men, they could snatch the lot by force, and go to perform the service, if they had the holy garments on. R. Shesheth says, in holy garments, because, if they had the ordinary ones on, they might by absence of mind perform the service in them, since they were very eager to perform the service.

MISHNA: The second lot (determined) who should slaughter, who sprinkle, who should clear of ashes the inner altar and who care for the lamp, who should take up members to the staircase of the altar: the head, the leg, the two forelegs, the tail (tip of tail), the (left) leg (hind), the chest, the windpipe, the two flanks, the entrails, the fine flour, the things made in pans [I Chron. ix. 31], and the wine.

Thirteen priests are privileged to do all this. Ben Azai, however, said, in the presence of R. Aqiba, in the name of R. Joshua: It (the animal) was offered as it had walked. (See Gemara.)

GEMARA: The schoolmen propounded a question: Were the lots drawn for each service separately, or at once for all services? Come and hear: R. Hiya taught, the lots were not drawn for each service separately; but the priest who had drawn the lot of the daily offering, obtained the service for the other twelve following him.

"*The second lot,*" etc. The schoolmen propounded a question: Who received the blood into the basin, the priest that slaughtered or the priest that sprinkled? Come and hear! We have learned that Ben Katin made twelve cocks for the laver, that twelve priests might sanctify their hands at once. If the priest that slaughtered received the blood, then thirteen cocks would have been needed. Hence infer that the sprinkler did it.

"*Ben Azai said,*" etc. The rabbis taught: What is meant

by "it had walked"? In the following order: The head and the leg, the chest, the stomach, the windpipe, the two forelegs, the two flanks, the tip of the tail, and the other hind leg. R. Jose says: As it has been stripped, so it was offered. How had it been stripped? The head, the leg, the tail, the other leg, the two flanks, the two forelegs, the chest, the windpipe.

R. Aqiba says: As it has been cut to pieces. How had it, then, been cut to pieces? The head, the leg, the two forelegs, the chest, the windpipe, the two flanks, the tail, and the other leg. R. Joseph the Galilean says: According to the excellence of the members. How is that? The head, the leg, the chest, the windpipe, the two flanks, the tail, the other leg, and the two forelegs. Said Rabba: Our Tana and R. Jose both agree that the members are to be offered in the order of their excellence. One, however, says, according to the size of the members; the other, according to the fatness. Why the head and leg together, according to all? Because the head contains too many bones, the leg, which contains more flesh, is added.

MISHNA: The third lot was drawn by new (priests) who had not yet fumed incense; the fourth, by new and old ones, (to determine) who should take up the members (parts) from the staircase to the altar.

GEMARA: We have learned in a Boraitha: No man has repeatedly offered incense. What is the reason? Said R. Hanina: Because the offering of incense renders rich. Said R. Papa to Abayi: Whence do we deduce this? Shall we assume this, because it is written [Deut. xxxiii. 10], "They shall put incense before thee," and in the next verse, "Bless, O Lord, his substance"? Then it should not be due to incense alone, since at the end of the tenth verse it is also written, "and whole burnt sacrifice upon thy altar." He answered him: A burnt-offering is frequent (besides being a daily sacrifice, it was offered by many individuals, and all could not get rich), but incense is not frequent.

Rabba said: You will not find a young scholar who decides questions in Law, who should not be of the tribe of Levi or Issachar. Levi, as it is written [ibid.]: "They (the tribe of Levi) shall teach thy ordinances unto Jacob; and Issachar, because it is written [I Chron. xii. 32]: "And of the children of Issachar, those who had understanding of the times." But why not also Jehudah? As it is written [Ps. lx. 9]: "Judah is my lawgiver." I mean, to deduce the traditional

sayings from the written Law (this can only do those of Levi and Issachar).

R. Johanan said: For the evening daily offering, lots were never drawn; he who had drawn the lot for that of the morning performed this service also.

MISHNA: [The parts of] the daily sacrifice are offered [according to circumstances] by nine, ten, eleven, twelve—no less and no more. How so? Itself by nine. During the Feast [of Booths] one carries a pitcher of water; thus it is ten. Toward evening by eleven, itself by nine, and two carrying two measures* of wood. On Sabbath by eleven, itself by nine, and two having in their hands two spoonfuls of frankincense for the showbread. On the Sabbath which occurs in the middle of the Feast [of Booths], one carrying a pitcher of water [added to the eleven].

GEMARA: Said R. Abba, according to others Rami b. Hama or R. Johanan: Water must be offered during the Feast of Tabernacles only with the morning daily offering, but not with that of evening. This we deduce from the Mishna which states: When the Sabbath occurs during the festival, one is added for carrying water. If water had to be offered with the evening offering also, then it would occur on another day of the festival than a Sabbath, as two carry measures of wood, and a third would be needed for carrying the water (and twelve were needed).

We have learned in a Boraitha: R. Simeon b. Jochai said: Whence do we deduce that the daily evening offering requires two measures of wood, carried by two priests? Since it is written [Lev. i. 7], "And (they shall) lay the wood in order," and as this cannot occur in case of the morning daily offering, as it is written [ibid. vi. 5], "The priest shall burn wood upon it every morning, and he shall lay in order upon it the burnt-offering," we must suppose, then, that what has been said before, applies to the daily evening offering.

R. Hiya taught: The lots amounted sometimes to thirteen, sometimes to fourteen, or fifteen, or sixteen (fourteen on the Feast of Tabernacles, for the pitcher of water; fifteen on the Sabbath; sixteen for the Sabbath during the Feast of Taber-

* The Hebrew term is *Gizrin*—גִּזְרִין. After Jost, we have translated it in Shekalim, VI., f., p. 28, "cords"; but as it is too heavy for two men to carry two cords of wood, we have here translated only "measures," and according to all commentators on the Mishna it is a certain measure of wood for the altar, unknown to us.

nacles). But did we not learn, seventeen ? That Boraitha is not according to R. Eliezer b. Jacob, but according to R. Jehudah.

MISHNA: A ram was offered by eleven: the flesh by five; the entrails, fine flour, and wine by two, respectively. A bull is offered by twenty-four: the head by one, the hind leg by two, the tail by two, and the [left] hind leg by two; the chest by one, the windpipe by three, the two forelegs by two, the two flanks by two; the entrails, fine flour, and wine by three, respectively. This refers to public sacrifices ! A private sacrifice could be offered, if one chose, by one. In respect of skinning and cutting to pieces, both [sacrifices] are equal [private or public, both may be skinned, etc., by a stranger].

GEMARA: We have learned in a Boraitha: The flaying and cutting into pieces may be performed by a layman. Said Hezkiah: Whence do we deduce this ? Because it is written [Lev. i. 7]: "And the sons of Aaron the priest shall put fire upon the altar." Hence only the fire must be put by priests, but the flaying may be done by others. But this verse is needful for its own sake, how can it be deduced from it ? Said R. Simeon b. Ashi: I once heard how Abayi explained it to his son as follows: It is written [ibid. 5]: "*He* shall kill." A layman is meant. How is this known ? Because it is written [Num. xviii. 7], "And thou and thy sons with thee shall keep your priesthood," one might say, that the slaughtering is also meant. Therefore it is written: "And he shall kill the young steer before the Lord, and the sons of Aaron the priest shall bring near the blood." From this we see that all that precedes the bringing near of the blood may be done by a layman. And it is also written [Lev. iii. 2]: "And he shall lay his hand . . . and kill it." From this it can be deduced that the layman who has laid his hand upon it may kill it.

[Rashi explains, that all this is stated in a Mishna elsewhere, and Abayi explained to his son that what Hezkiah had said is in accordance with that Mishna.] Now let us see: We have concluded that from the sprinkling of the blood onwards all must be performed by priests; and the fire is put upon the altar later. Why is it then necessary to say that Aaron's sons should do it ? This is to exclude the flaying and cutting into pieces, which, though they come after the sprinkling of the blood, may be done by a layman.

It was taught: R. Assi in the name of R. Johanan said: If a layman has put the two measures of wood on the altar, he is

liable to capital punishment, as it is a service belonging to the following day (and not the final service of the night). Rabba opposed: According to this supposition (that it is a service of the day), a lot had to be drawn ? Rabba has forgotten what we have learned above, that he who drew the lot to lift the ashes, also obtained the privilege to arrange the measures of wood. Said Mar Zutra, according to others R. Ashi: How can it be said it is a service of the next day ? Did we not learn further in the Mishna: " Go and see whether it is time to slaughter " ? If the arranging of the wood was also a service of the next day, why was not this mentioned likewise (for if it were done when it was yet night it would be invalid) ? This is no difficulty. If the animal was slaughtered before the time, it was invalid, but if the wood was put on before the time, it could be removed and replaced by a priest after daybreak.*

* In the text there is still another interpretation, that R. Johanan means to say that the service in question is but the final service of the night and does not belong to the day ; and again, questions and answers are raised and made, and it is so complicated that both Rashi and Tosaphoth could not explain it without additions and omissions, and the result seems to be, after all, that the service belongs to the day. We have therefore, contrary to our method, omitted it.

CHAPTER III.

REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE TIME OF SLAUGHTERING THE DAILY OFFERING, THE ENTERING OF A LAYMAN INTO THE COURT OF THE TEMPLE, AND THE ORDER OF THE HIGH-PRIEST'S SERVICE ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT.

MISHNA: The Superintendent used to say to them: Go out and see whether the time for slaughtering has come. If it had come, the one who saw it said: "(*Bargai*) It becomes light." Matthew b. Samuel says: He used to ask: "Is the whole east bright, as far as Hebron?" and he answered: "Yea."

[Why was all this necessary? Because on one occasion the moonlight was bright, and they mistook it for dawn. They slaughtered the daily sacrifice, and removed it to the place of burning (finding it unfit).] The high-priest used to be then taken down to the bath. This was the rule in the temple: After necessary human needs a bath had to be taken, and after making water one had to wash his hands and feet.

GEMARA: We have learned in a Boraitha: R. Ishmael said: He said: "*Baraq bargai*." And R. Aqiba said: "*Ala' bargai* (The light has risen)." Ne'huma b. Aphaqshyon said: He said: "It has become light even at Hebron. But R. Jehudah b. Bathyrha said: He said: "The whole east is bright, as far as Hebron." Then each went to do his work. When each went to his work, it was full day. Did they wait so long? It is meant, those who needed laborers went to look for them. Said R. Sophra: The Mincha prayer of Abraham was when the walls begin to be blackened by shadow. Said R. Joseph: Have we to imitate Abraham? Said Rabha: The Tana learns from Abraham, why shall we not? As we have learned in the following Boraitha: It is written [Lev. xii. 3]: On the eighth day shall the flesh of his foreskin be circumcised." But those who are devout do this religious duty early in the morning. As it is written [Gen. xxii. 3]: "And Abraham rose up early in the morning." Therefore says Rabha: How can we learn of Abraham? He was an older

man, who taught the public,* and his actions are not to be applied to common men.

"Matthew b. Samuel says," etc. Who used to say, "Yea"? If you wish, I will say, he who stood on the roof used to say: "The east is bright," and as the one who stood beneath asked him: "As far as Hebron?" he would reply: "Yea." And if you wish, I can say: He who stood beneath used to say: "Is the east bright?" The one on the roof would then say: "As far as Hebron?" He would reply: "Yea." (Rashi explains: It is written elsewhere: Why Hebron? To remind of the merit of the patriarchs.)

"Why was all this necessary?" How could they have made this mistake? Did we not learn in a Boraitha: Rabbi said: The beams of the moon are not like to those of the sun. For those of the moon rise straight like sticks, whereas those of the sun diverge in all directions. The disciples of R. Ishmael taught: That time it was a cloudy day, and the moon's rays were multiplied in all directions as those of the sun.

R. Na'hman said: The heat during a clouded day is worse than the solar heat itself. A similar instance I can show: A barrel of vinegar smells more strongly when one hole is made in it than when it is wholly opened. A mixed light (of the sun and fire) is more unendurable (by the eye) than the solar light itself. A similar case: It is more difficult to stand under a shower, than to enter wholly into water. The thoughts about women are more exhausting than the sin itself. A similar case: The smell of wasted meat is more irritating than the meat itself. The heat of the end of summer is worse than that of the summer itself (because it is easier to catch a cold, because the body has been inured to heat during the summer). A similar case is: When an oven is heated four or five times a day, then even a couple of pieces of wood render it hot. Fever is much worse in the winter than in the summer. A like case is: In a cold oven much wood is necessary to heat it; hence if one has a high temperature in the winter, the fever must be great. To study old subjects is much more difficult than a wholly new subject. A like case: It is easier to make clay of new sand than of sand which had once been part of a building.

* Here follows a passage to prove that whenever "old man" is used in the Bible, one who teaches in a college is meant; but as it is mentioned elsewhere we omit it.

R. Abahu said: What is the reason that Rabbi says that the solar rays are in all directions? Because it is written [Ps. xxii. 1]: "To the chief musician upon the hind of dawn." As a hind has her horns diverging, so are the sun's rays.

R. Elazar said: Why are the prayers of the upright compared to a hind? As the horns of a hind diverge as long as they grow, so the more prayers they will offer, the more they are heard.

"*They slaughtered the daily sacrifice.*" To what does this refer? If all the year (they mistook the passage beginning with "The high-priest" to be connected with the foregoing), why was the high-priest taken to the bath? During the whole year he does not sacrifice? If it refers to the Day of Atonement, then there is no moon in the middle of the night (as it is the tenth day in the month). The answer is, the two passages have no connection. When it was bright, they took him to the bath.

"*This is the rule,*" etc. The feet he had to wash, since it was possible they had been defiled while performing the function; but the hands? Said R. Abba: Hence it can be inferred, that it is a merit to clean with one's hand the feet in such a case. And this is in support of what R. Ammi had said: A man may not go out into the street when his feet have been thus defiled, lest it be said that he is suffering from a certain infirmity [Deut. xxiii. 2, end]—lest it be said his children are bastards.

MISHNA: No one may enter the forecourt [even of Israelites, not priests] to do service, even when he is clean, before he has bathed. On this day the high-priest bathes five times, and washes his hands and feet ten times. All these ablutions are taken within the sanctuary, over Beth Haparva, except the first. A screen of linen [byssus] was placed between him and the people.

GEMARA: B. Zorna was asked: What was the bathing needed for? He said: If one passes from one holy place to another, and from a place which it is *Karaith* to enter, to a similar place, still one must take a bath; how much more when one passes from the forecourt, which is not a holy place, and which it is not *Karaith* to enter, to the sanctuary. R. Jehudah says: The bathing is not obligatory. It is only used as a reminder. If he was once unclean, and forgot to bathe, he will now remember it, and will wait after bathing till sunset. On what point do they differ? In case he entered without having bathed, according to R. Zerna, he has committed a sin, and rendered the service invalid; according to R. Jehudah, he has not.

Abayi asked R. Joseph: Ought there to be nothing between his body and the water in this bathing, as in other bathing? Or if it is only as according to R. Jehudah, that does not matter? He answered: All that the rabbis have ordered must be done as if it were biblical. He asked him again: If only a part of his body (as head, foot, hand) is introduced into the sanctuary, is a bathing also necessary? He replied: The thumbs and great toes of a leper, which must be besprinkled by the priest with blood [Lev. xiv. 14], he yet introduced into the sanctuary, while standing in the gate of Nicanor, as we have learned in a Boraitha. We see, then, that this was not considered entering, as he could not enter himself.

"*Bathes five times.*" The rabbis taught: Five times the high-priest bathed, and washed his hands and feet ten times, all this in the sanctuary over the Beth Haparva, except the first, which was not in the sanctuary, but over the Gate of Water, and near the high-priest's chamber.

"*A screen of byssus,*" etc. Why one of byssus? That is according to R. Kahna, as he says further, to remind him that the service of this day is in the linen clothes (not golden). So we say it is meant in this case.

MISHNA: He undressed, went down, and dived. After he had come out again, and wiped himself (dried himself with a sponge?), the garments of cloth of gold were brought to him, which he put on, and then washed his hands and feet. They brought to him the daily sacrifice; he made an incision, and another completed the slaughtering in his presence. He took up the blood, and sprinkled it, went in to fume the morning (matinal) incense, and to trim the lamps, as well as to offer the head, the members, the things made in pans, and the wine.

The morning incense was offered between the blood and the members; that of evening, between the members and drink-offerings. If he was an aged or delicate high-priest, the cold water of the bath was mixed with water warmed previously.

GEMARA: Our Mishna, which says that after bathing he put on the garments of cloth of gold without having washed his hands and feet previously, is not in accordance with R. Meir, who maintains that the hands and feet must be washed twice at each time of his putting on the garments. As we have learned in the following Boraitha: A screen of linen was placed between him and the people. He undressed himself, went down, dived, came out, wiped himself. They brought him the garments of

cloth of gold, he put them on, he washed his hands and his feet. R. Meir, however, said: He undressed himself, washed his hands and feet, and then went down, and dived. He came up, dried himself. They brought him the garments of cloth of gold, he put them on, then washed his hands and his feet. It is right, according to R. Meir, who says that for each diving two washings of the hands and feet are needed; that ten times he should wash his hands and feet, as in the Mishna. But according to the rabbis, who say only once, there will be but nine? The rabbis can reply, that the last time he washed his hands and feet, was when he stripped himself of the holy garments and had to put on his week-day clothes, after the whole service.

We have learned in a Boraitha: Rabbi Jehudah said: How is it known that the high-priest has to dive five times, and wash his hands and feet ten times? Because it is written [Lev. xvi. 23]: "And Aaron shall then go into the tabernacle of the congregation, and he shall take off the linen garments, which he had put on when he went into the holy place, and he shall leave them there. And he shall wash his flesh with water in a holy place, and put on his garments, and come then forth, and offer," etc. From this we infer that between one service and the other he had to dive. So also said Rabha, with the addition: Because it is written [ibid. 4], "These are holy garments," that proves that all holy clothes are equal. This day there were five services: The daily morning offering, in garments of cloth of gold; the service of the day, in linen clothes; his ram and the people's ram, in garments of cloth of gold; the spoon and the censer, in linen clothes; the daily evening offering, in garments of cloth of gold. (For the five services, were five divings.) How is it known that for each diving two times have the hands and feet to be washed? Because it is written [ibid.]: "He shall take off his garments . . . and shall wash, . . . put on . . ." The phrase "shall wash" applies to the taking off and the putting on of the garments. From this we see only that when he takes off the linen garment, and puts on cloth of gold, he must wash himself. How do we know that when he takes off the garments of cloth of gold, and puts on the linen ones, he must wash himself? The disciples of R. Ishmael have taught: This can be inferred by a reasoning *a fortiori*. If when he puts off the linen clothes, whose atonement is not great, still he must have a bathing, how much more when he puts off the cloth of gold, whose atonement is great?

But it may be asked, Is the atonement of the linen clothes not great? Did not the high-priest enter in them the Holy of Holies? It is written [ibid. 4]: "These are holy garments, therefore shall he wash his flesh in water (and both the cloth of gold and linen garments are holy.)"

"*He made an incision.*" How much? Says Ulla: The greater part of the windpipe and the gullet. So also have said R. Johanan and Resh Lakish. Abayi ordered the services according to a tradition he had, and it agrees with that of Abbu Saul. The (first) great arrangement of wood preceded the second arrangement of wood on the southwestern corner of the altar (as will be explained in Tamid). This preceded the two measures of wood, and they preceded the removal of the ashes from the inner altar, and this preceded the trimming of the five lamps. This preceded the sprinkling of the blood of the morning daily offering, and this preceded the trimming of the two lamps; and this preceded the offering of the incense, which came before the offering of the members; this was before the meal-offering, and this was before the things baked in pans. This preceded the drink-offering, and this preceded the additional offerings (for Sabbath or festival), and these were before the spoonfuls of frankincense, that preceded the daily evening offering, as it is written [Lev. vi. 5]: "He shall burn thereon the fat of the peace-offerings." From the word *Hashlamim* (peace-offerings) can be inferred that they should complete the service of the day (this word means, also, *completion*).

The Master says: "The first great arrangement of wood preceded. The second," etc. How is it known? Because it is written [Lev. vi. 2]: "It is the burnt-offering which shall be burning upon the altar all night. And after that it is written: "And the fire of the altar shall be burning upon it." By this the other arrangement of wood is meant. How is it known that this precedes the two measures of wood? Because it is written [ibid. 5]: "The priest shall burn wood on it every morning." On it, and not on the other fire. From this we infer there is another fire. Which? That of the two measures of wood. How is it known the two measures of wood precede the clearing of the inner altar? Although in both places it is written, "every morning," yet we understand that preparation for service precedes the mere removal of ashes. Whence do we deduce that this precedes the trimming of the five lamps? Says Abayi: I have it so by tradition, but I know no reason. Rabba says:

I know it is according to Resh Lakish, who says when one meets an opportunity to perform a meritorious act, one should not pass by it. When the priest enters, he meets first the altar, then the lamps. And what is the reason that this precedes the blood of the daily morning offering? And this precedes the two lamps? Says Abayi: Since it is written of the measures of wood "every morning" twice, (in Hebrew) superfluously, let it apply to the five lamps and to the two lamps, the one to precede the blood of the morning sacrifice, the other to follow it. How do we know that these two lamps precede the incense? Because it is written [Exod. xxx. 7]: "When he dresseth the lamps, (then) shall he burn it." How is it known that the incense comes before the members? Of the incense [ibid.] it is said "*every* morning," but of the daily sacrifice only "morning." [The first precedes the second.] Why do the members come before the meal-offering? Because we have learned in a Boraitha as follows: Whence do we deduce, that before the daily morning offering has been sacrificed nothing else shall be offered? Because it is written [Lev. vi. 5]: "He shall lay in order upon it the burnt-offering." In addition to this Boraitha, said Rabba: By the word *the* burnt-offering is meant the first burnt-offering; that is, the daily offering. How is it known that the meal-offering precedes the things made in pans? Because they are mentioned [Lev. xxiii. 37] in this order. How is it known the things made in pans precede the drink-offering? Because they are also a meal-offering, and added to the daily sacrifice [Num. xxviii. 5]. And why do these precede the additional sacrifice? Because in that verse [Lev. xxiii. 37] they are mentioned in this order. And why do these precede the spoonfuls of frankincense? Did we not learn in a Boraitha that they succeed the frankincense? About this, Tanaim differ. (Pesachim, p 107.) Said Abayi: It seems to me the Halakha prevails, that the additional sacrifices ought to precede the frankincense. Because we have seen that of which it is said "every morning" precedes that of which it is said "morning." [See Lev. xxiv. 7 and 8.] Here of the additional sacrifice is said "every and each *day*," hence—not *morning*.

"*The morning incense was offered between the blood and members.*" According to whom is this? If according to the rabbis, it should have been between the blood and lamps; and if according to Abbu Saul, it should have been between the lamps and the members? The whole Mishna is according to the rabbis,

but about the order the arranger of the Mishna has not been particular.

"That of evening, between the members and drink-offerings." How do we know this? Because it is written [Num. xxviii. 8]: "As the meat-offering of the morning, and the drink-offering thereof, shalt thou prepare it." As in the case of the meat-offering the incense precedes the drink-offering, so in the evening the incense shall precede the drink-offering.

The rabbis taught: It is written [ibid. 7]: "The drink-offering thereof shall be the fourth part of a hin." "Thereof," of the evening sacrifice [ibid. 4]. We deduce concerning the morning sacrifice from the evening sacrifice. Rabbi, however, said: On the contrary, we deduce concerning the evening offering from the morning offering. It is right, according to the rabbis, since that of the evening is mentioned last. But what is Rabbi's reason? Said Rabba b. Ulla: Because it is written [ibid. 7], "for the one sheep," and [ibid. 4] "the one sheep," hence in both cases the same morning offering is meant.

"If he was an aged or delicate high-priest." We have learned in a Boraitha: R. Jehudah said: Iron plates were heated on the eve of the Day of Atonement, and were on the Day of Atonement plunged into the cold water, to warm it for the high-priest. But the iron gets tempered thereby (which is forbidden as a work)? R. Bibi answers: The iron had not been heated so much as to become tempered. Abayi, however, says: It does not matter, since it is not intentional, and therefore not forbidden.

MISHNA: They brought him to Beth-Haparva, which was in the sanctuary; a linen screen was spread out between him and the people; he washed his hands and feet and stripped himself. R. Meir says: He undressed, and washed his hands and feet. He went down and dived, came up and dried himself, white garments were brought to him, which he put on, and he washed his hands and feet.

In the morning, he put on linen of Pelusium, costing twelve Minas. In the evening, Hindoo linen, of 800 Zuz [8 Minas]. This is according to R. Meir. The sages say, in the morning he put on garments worth 18 Minas, in the evening of 12 Minas— together amounting to 30 Minas. This from public money [*another version*, taken from the holy funds?]; but if he chooses, he can have them more costly out of his private means.

GEMARA: Why is it called Parva? Said R. Joseph: Because it was built by one Parva, one of the magi.

"In the morning he put on linen of Pelusium." Wherefore does he tell us the price? He comes to teach us that linen less costly were invalid. Let us see: All agree that what he put on in the morning was more costly than that in the evening. Whence is this deduced? Said R. Huna, the son of R. Ilai: Because [Lev. xvi. 4] linen is mentioned four times in that verse; in reference to the morning garments, they are to be of the best linen.

R. Huna b. Jehudah, according to others R. Samuel b. Jehudah, taught: After the service of the congregation was finished, if the high-priest possessed a linen coat made by his mother at her own cost, he might put it on, and perform the services appertaining to an individual (not congregation: carry out the spoons from the Holy of Holies, and the censer; the first had been used for frankincense, the second for incense), provided that when he puts it on, he shall bestow it on the congregation. It was said of R. Ishmael b. Phabi: His mother had made him a linen coat worth 100 Minas; he used to put it on, perform the services of an individual, and bestow it (in his mind) on the congregation. Of R. Eliezer b. Harsum it was said: His mother had made him a linen coat worth 20,000 Minas. His brethren the priests did not permit him to put it on, as in it he seemed to be naked (so delicate was its texture). How could this be, if it is said to have been thick, the threads six times twisted? Said Abayi: As wine is seen through a glass, however thick it be.

The rabbis taught: In the world to come, when a poor man, a rich man, and a wicked man come before the judgment, when the poor is asked, "Why hast thou not studied the Law?" if he answers: "I have been poor, I had to earn my bread, and had no time," they answer him: "Wast thou poorer than Hillel the Elder?" Of Hillel the Elder it was said: Every day he went to work, and earned a Tarpeik (a *Stater* coin of 4 Dinars). Half he gave away to the porter of the college, to let him in, and on the other half he and his family lived. Once it happened he did not earn anything, the porter did not let him in. He ascended the roof where there was an opening, and listened to the words of the living God, from the mouth of Shemaia and Abtalian. It was said: That day was a Friday, and in the season of Tebeth (winter), and he was besnowed. When it dawned, Shemaia said to Abtalian: "Every day it becomes light at this time, and now it is dark. Is it such a cloudy day?" They raised their eyes, and saw the figure of a man. When they went

up, they found on him a layer of snow three ells thick. They took him down, washed him, dressed him with oil, placed him before a fire, and they said: "Such a man deserves that Sabbath should be violated for his sake (by the making of fire)."

When the rich man is asked: "Why hast thou not studied the Law?" if he answers: "Because I was a rich man, and had many estates, and had no time to study," they answer him: "Wast thou richer than R. Elazar b. Harsum?" Of him it was said: His father had bequeathed to him a thousand towns on land, and a thousand ships on the sea, and he himself used to take a bag of flour on his shoulder, and wander from town to town and land to land to study the Law. Once his own slaves found him, and put him to hard labor. He said to them: "I pray you, let me go to study the Torah." They replied: "We swear, by R. Elazar b. Harsum's life, we will not let you go before you work." Thus, as long as he lived, he did not attend to his affairs, but studied all day and all night the Law.

When the wicked man is asked: "Why hast thou not studied the Law?" if he replies: "I was handsome, and was absorbed by my sins," they answer him: "Wast thou more handsome than Joseph?" It was said of Joseph the Righteous, that every day Potiphar's wife used to try to seduce him by her talk. The clothes she used to put on in the morning (to attract his attention) she did not put on in the evening, and *vice versa*, and her refrain was always: "Listen to me; do what I ask of you." He answered: "No." She said: "I will imprison you." He replied [Ps. cxlv. 7]: "The Lord looseneth the prisoners." She then said: "I will bend your loftiness." His reply was [ibid.]: "The Lord raiseth up those who are bowed down." She said to him: "I will blind you." He answered [ibid. 8]: "The Lord causeth the blind to see." She gave him a thousand talents of silver. He was averse to her, or "to lie with her, or to be with her" [Gen. xxxix. 10]. "To lie with her" in this world, "to be with her" in the world to come.

From this we see that Hillel makes the poor man guilty, R. Eliezer b. Harsum the rich, and Joseph the wicked.

MISHNA: He went to his bullock, which stood between the porch and the altar, his head due south, but his face due west. The high-priest stood on the east, his face due west. He put his two hands on him and confessed himself in the following terms: I beseech thee, Jehovah, I have committed iniquities, have transgressed, and have sinned before thee, I and my house.

I beseech thee, Jehovah, forgive, pray, the iniquities, the transgressions, and the sins, which I have committed, transgressed, and sinned before thee, I and my house, as it is written in the Torah of Moses thy servant, "For on that day shall he make an atonement for you," etc. [Lev. xvi. 30]. They respond after him: "Blessed be the name of His kingdom's glory for ever!"

GEMARA: "*His head due south, but his face due west.*" If his head was turned to the south, how could his face be turned to the west? Said Rabh: His head was turned aside. Why? Says Abayi: It was apprehended, lest he should excrete. The rabbis taught: How were the hands imposed on his head? The sacrifice stood in the north, his face turned westward; he who imposed his hand stood in the east, his face westward; he placed both his hands between the two horns, provided that there was nothing between his hands and the head of the sacrifice; then he confessed himself. On the sin-offering he confessed the sins for which a sin-offering has to be brought; on a trespass-offering, the sins corresponding to it; and on a burnt-offering, sins of preventing the poor to gather, not forgetting for the poor, and not leaving corners [Lev. xix. 9]. So said R. Joel the Galilean.

The rabbis taught: How did the high-priest confess? He said: "I have committed iniquities, transgressed, and sinned." So he confessed over the goat [Lev. xvi. 21]: "And confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions, in all their sins." (The order of the terms is the same.) So also by Moses is it written [Ex. xxxiv. 7], "Forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin." So says R. Meir. The sages, however, say: By iniquities are meant intentional transgressions, for it is written [Num. xv. 31]: "That person shall be cut off, his iniquity is upon him." By transgressions are meant rebellion. As it is written [2 Kings iii. 7]: "The King of Moab hath rebelled." (The term in Hebrew is the same.) By sin is meant unintentional wrong, as is written [Lev. iv. 2]: "If any person sin through ignorance." Now, is it possible that after he has confessed the intentional and rebellious sins, he will confess the errors? Therefore we must say that he used to say differently: "I have sinned, committed iniquities, and transgressed, I and my house." And so it is written by David [Ps. cxi. 6]: "We have sinned together with our fathers, we have committed iniquity, we have done wickedly. . . ." • And so also Solomon says [1 Kings viii. 47]: "We have sinned, we have committed iniquity, we have acted wickedly." So also

Daniel [Dan. ix. 5]: "We have sinned, and have committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled." Why, then, is it said by Moses: "Forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin." Moses said to the Holy One, blessed be He: "Lord of the Universe, when the children of Israel will sin before thee, and then repent, mayest thou consider their intentional sins as sins done through ignorance." Said Rabbi b. Samuel in the name of Rabh: The Halakha prevails according to the sages. Is not this self-evident? R. Meir is an individual, the sages are a majority, and we know that the decree of an individual is prevailed over by that of the majority? Lest one say, In this case the Halakha ought to prevail according to R. Meir, as he takes in his support what Moses said. He comes to teach us that here also the Halakha is according to the majority.

One of the scholars prayed for the people in the presence of Rabba, and followed R. Meir's decree. Said Rabba to him: Thou departest from the rabbis, and doest as R. Meir says. He replied: I hold with R. Meir, for it is written in the Bible that Moses said so.

"*They respond after him.*" We have learned in a Boraitha: Rabbi said: It is written [Deut. xxxii. 3]: "When I call on the name of the Lord, ascribe ye greatness unto our God." So said Moses to Israel: "When I mention the name of the Holy One, blessed be He, ye shall add greatness to it." Hananiah the son of R. Joshua's brother said: From the following verse [Prov. x. 7]: "The memory of the just is blessed." That means, the prophet says to Israel: "When I mention the Just One of the Worlds, ye shall add a blessing."

MISHNA: He came to the eastern part of the forecourt, to the north of the altar, the Segan of the high-priest on his right, and the head of the family ministering during the week [Rosh-Beth-Ab] on his left. There were two he-goats; and a box was there wherein were two lots. Of box-tree they were. [The high-priest] Ben Gamla made them of gold, for which his memory was praised.

[The high-priest] Ben Katin made twelve cocks to the laver, which had had only two. He also made a machine to the laver [to take it down into a well at will], that its water should not become unfit by being kept over night [in free air]. The king Monobaz made all the handles of the utensils used on the Day of Atonement—of gold. Helen, his mother, made a golden can-

delabrum over the temple-gate. She likewise made a tablet of gold, whereon was inscribed the section about a woman who goes aside [Num. v. 12]. Miracles happened to the gates which Nicanor brought. Therefore all these persons' memory was praised.

GEMARA: "*The Segan on his right.*" R. Jehudah said: One who goes on the right of his Master is a boor. An objection was raised from this Mishna: It is written that the Segan was on his right. And we have learned in a Boraitha, that when three walk, the Master ought to be in the middle, the greater of two on his right, and the other on his left. And so we find that of the three angels that came to Abraham, Michael was in the middle, Gabriel on his right, and Raphael on his left. (How, then, is he a boor?)

R. Samuel b. Papa explained before R. Adda, that it is meant, he should walk on his right, but a little behind, and not side by side. Did we not learn in a Boraitha that he who precedes the Master is rude, and he who walks behind his Master is too ostentatiously humble? He should fall a little back—not precede, and not follow.

"*And a box was there,*" etc. The rabbis taught: It is written [Lev. xxi. 8]: "And Aaron shall put lots upon the two goats." Hence, lots of any kind. Should we assume, that he must place two on each goat? Therefore it is written: "One lot for the Lord, one lot for Azazel." Therefore one ought to be for the Lord, and one for Azazel. Should we assume that he should place both lots on one goat, and then draw them and then place them on the other goat, and draw again? Therefore it is written, "one lot." What, then, means the word "lots"? This signifies that they should be equal: one should not be made of gold, the other of silver; one large, the other small. It is said in the Boraitha, lots of all kinds. This is self-evident? It must teach us this because of another Boraitha: Because the plate on the high-priest's brow, on which the name of the Lord was written, was of gold, one might think this lot must also be so. Therefore it is written, "one lot," twice, to teach that they may be of many kinds, of olive-tree wood, of nut-tree wood, of box-tree wood.

"*Ben Katin made twelve cocks,*" etc. We have so learned in a Boraitha, to the end that the twelve priests engaged in the service of the morning daily offering might wash their hands and feet at the same time. We have learned again in a Boraitha: In

the morning, when the laver was full, the high-priest washed his hands from the upper cock; but in the evening when he departed, when it was not full, he did it from the lower cock.

"He also made a machine." What machine? Says Abayi: He made a sort of wheel, which brought it down into the well.

"Helen his mother," etc. We have learned in a Boraitha: When the sun rose, from the golden candelabrum emanated rays, and all knew it was time to read Shema. ●

"Miracles happened to the gates," etc. The rabbis taught: What miracles have happened to his gates? It was said, when Nicanor had gone to Alexandria, and was returning with the gates, the waves of the sea threatened to drown him; they took one of the gates and cast it into the sea. The sea was not appeased. They desired to cast the second gate overboard also. He took it on his body, and said: "Fling me together with it." Thereupon the sea became quiet. He grieved for the other gate. When he came to the coast at Acco, the gate appeared by the ship. According to others, some beast of the sea had swallowed the gate, and afterward spit it out. Therefore all gates of the Temple were gilt, except Nicanor's, because miracles had happened to them, and they were therefore left as they were. Others say, because their bronze was brilliant. R. Eliezer b. Jacob says: It was polished bronze, and glittered like gold.

MISHNA: And the memories of the following were mentioned with blame; those of the house of Garmo, they were unwilling to teach the art of making the showbread; those of the house of Abtinas, who did not want to teach the art of preparing the incense; Hogros b. Levi, who knew something in music which he was unwilling to instruct others in; Ben Kamtsar did not want to teach the art of writing. Of the first it is said: "The memory of the just is blessed" [Prov. x. 7]; but of the rest is said: "But the name of the wicked shall rot."

GEMARA: The rabbis taught: "The house of Garmo were skilled in making the showbread, and did not want to teach it to others. The sages sent for workers from Alexandria, and they could bake as well, but could not take it out from the oven [it got broken]. They heated the oven from outside, and baked it there, and took it from there, while the house of Garmo heated it inside and baked it inside (and removed it from there). Also the showbread of the Alexandrian bakers used to become mouldy, and that of the former never became so. When the sages heard this, they said: All which the Lord hath created, He created

only for His glory. As it is written [Is. xlivi. 7]: "Every one that is called by my name, I have created for my glory." So the Beth Garmo had to be invited again to resume their post. The sages sent for them, they did not come: so their wages had to be doubled. They used to receive 12 Minas daily, and henceforth 24. R. Jehudah says: They had received 24, and thenceforth 48. Then the sages inquired of them: "Why are you unwilling to instruct others?" They replied: "Our family knows by tradition that this Temple will one day fall, and then, if we will have taught it to an improper person, he may go and serve thereby other idols." And for this thing their memory was praised: their children were never seen to use bread of pure flour, that it should not be suspected they took it from the flour for the showbread. They did it, to fulfil what is written [Num. xxxii. 22]: "And ye be thus guiltless before the Lord, and before Israel."

"*Those of the house of Abtinas,*" etc. The rabbis taught: The house of Abtinas were skilled in the preparing of incense, and were unwilling to teach it. The sages sent for workers from Alexandria. These could prepare the incense, but could not make it so that the smoke should not bend. The smoke of the incense prepared by the house of Abtinas rose straight, like a rod, and the smoke of the others' incense bent hither and thither. When the sages heard of this, they said, etc. [the same as previously; the reason they gave for not teaching was also the same]. For the following thing they were mentioned with praise: Never a bride of their house went out perfumed, and even when one of their house married a woman of another family, it was on the condition that she should not be perfumed, that it be not said: "They take it from the incense." To fulfil what is written, etc. [as before].

We have learned in a Boraitha: R. Ishmael said: I once was in the road, and met one of their grandchildren. I said to him: Your ancestors wished to increase their own glory, and diminish that of the Lord; now the Lord's glory persists, and yours has ended in nothing. R. Aqiba said: R. Ishmael b. Luga has related to me: I and one of their grandchildren once went out into the field to gather grass. I observed that he wept and rejoiced. I inquired of him: Why wepest thou? He replied: I recall the honor my ancestors once had enjoyed, and weep. And why did he rejoice? "Because I feel sure that the Holy One, blessed be He, will restore it to us." He asked him: Why hast thou

been reminded of it just at present? He said: Because I see the grass we used to put in to make the smoke straight. He said to him: Point it out to me. He replied: We are under an oath not to show it to anyone. Said R. Johanan b. Nuri: It happened once I met an old man, who had a scroll on which was a list of the names of the spices composing the incense. I asked him: Whence art thou? He replied: I am descended of the house of Abtinas. "And what do you hold in your hand?" He said: The scrolls of the spices. I said to him: Show it to me. He said: As long as our family was in life, they did not show it to any man. But now, when they have all died, and the Temple itself no longer exists, I can give it to thee, but be cautious with it. When I related all this to R. Aqiba, he said: From this time one need not blame them any longer. To this said Ben Azai: "By thy name thou shalt be called and to thy position thou shalt be restored, and thine thou wilt always receive, as so it is recorded Above." It is a rule, one man cannot touch what is destined for another [as they were recalled and paid double wages].

"*Hogros b. Levi*," etc. We have learned in a Boraitha: When he had to render his voice melodious, he placed his thumb in his mouth, and the index in his mustache. When all his fellow-priests heard his voice, they bent to the ground (from ecstasy).

The rabbis taught: Ben Kamtsar did not want to teach the art of writing. It was said of him: He used to take four quills between his four fingers, and when he had to write a word of four letters, he wrote it at once. (Jehovah's name is of four letters.) When they inquired of him: Why dost thou not teach it to others? he found no answer. Therefore of the first it is said: "The memory of the just is blessed"; and of Ben Kamtsar and his tribe it is said: "The name of the wicked shall rot." What is meant by "rot"? How can a name "rot"? Said R. Elazar: Their name shall contract such a rottenness that children shall not be named after them.

Rabbina said to one of the scholars who arranged for him the Agada: How do we know that the rabbis have said: "The name of the just is blessed"? He replied: Why rabbis—it is in the Bible, in the Proverbs? He said: Nay. How is it known from the Pentateuch? It is known from the following verse [Gen. xviii. 17]: "Shall I hide from Abraham what I am about to do?" And the next verse is: "Abraham shall surely become a

great nation." And how is it known from the Pentateuch that the name of the wicked shall rot? Because it is written [ibid. xiii. 12]: "And pitched his tents close to Sodom." And the next: "The men of Sodom were wicked and sinners." R. Elazar said: From the blessings awarded to the righteous, one can infer what curses are bestowed on the wicked; as it is written [ibid. xviii. 19]: "For I know him, that he will command," etc. And the next verse is: "The Lord said, Because the cry against Sodom and Gomorrah is great." And from the curses given to the wicked the blessings reserved for the righteous can be inferred, as it is written [ibid. xiii. 13]: "The men of Sodom were wicked and sinners." And the next verse says: "And the Lord said unto Abram, Lift up now thy eyes and look," etc.

R. Elazar says again: Even for one just man is a whole world created. As it is written [Gen. i. 4]: "And God saw the light, that it was good." And good is only a just man, since it is written [Is. iii. 10]: "Say to the just, that he is good."* R. Elazar says again: Whoever forgets something of his study, causes exile to his children, as is written [Hosea iv. 6]: "As thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, so will I myself also forget thy children." R. Abahu says: He is degraded from his high station, as it is written [ibid.]: "Because thou hast rejected knowledge, so will I also reject thee from officiating before me."

R. Hiya b. Abba said in the name of R. Johanan: A righteous man does not depart from the world, till another righteous man like him has been created, as it is written [Eccles. i. 5]: "The sun rises, the sun goes down." Before the sun of Eli had been extinguished, the sun of Samuel of Ramah already shone. The same said again: The Holy One, blessed be He, perceived that righteous men are few: He planted them in every generation, as it is written [I Sam. ii. 8]: "For the Lord's are the pillars of the earth, on which He hath set the world." And the same said once more, on the same authority: Even when there is only one just man in the world, the world can exist through his merit, as it is written [Prov. x. 25]: "The righteous is the foundation of the world." R. Hiya says, on his own authority, as it is written in a different verse [I Sam. ii. 9]: "He ever guardeth the feet of his pious ones." But they are spoken of in the plural? Says R. Na'hman, it is read in the plural, but it is written in the singular. R. Hiya b. Abba says again, in the

* The Talmud translates it thus, literally.

name of R. Johanan: When a man has lived the greatest part of his life without having sinned, he will sin no more, for they will guard him Above, and this he infers from the above passage. The disciples of R. Shila have said: When a man has had occasion to commit a sin once and twice, and he escapes committing it, he will be guarded Above from sinning. They infer it from the same verse. Resh Lakish said: It is written [Prov. iii. 34]: "The mockers He will mock, but to the modest He will give grace." From this we can infer: If one wishes to defile himself (to sin) the door is opened to him; but he who comes to purify himself, he is assisted. The disciples of R. Ishmael have told a parable in reference to this: When one sells both naphtha and perfumes, when one arrives to buy naphtha, he saith to him: "Measure the quantity you need"; but if one arrives to buy perfumes, he says: "Wait, we will both measure it, and contract the odor." The same disciples taught: A sin stops up a man's heart, as it is written [Lev. xi. 43]: "And ye shall not make yourselves unclean with them, that ye should be defiled thereby." Do not read **וְנִטְמַתָּה מִן** but **וְנִטְמֵת מִן** (stop up).

The rabbis taught: This verse signifies that when a man defiles himself a little here below, Above he is defiled much; and if he defiles himself in this world, he is defiled in the world to come. And it is written [ibid. 44]: "Ye shall sanctify yourselves, and be holy." When a man sanctifies himself a little here below, he is sanctified much Above, and when he sanctifies himself in this world, he is sanctified in the world to come.

CHAPTER IV.

REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE TWO GOATS OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT : HOW THEY WERE SLAUGHTERED, SENT AWAY, ETC.

MISHNA: He shook the box, and took out two lots. On one is written, "to Jehovah"; on the other is written, "to Azazel." The Segan is at his right, and the head of the family [see above] on his left. If that of Jehovah was taken up by his right hand, the Segan says to him, "My lord the high-priest, raise thy right hand." If that of Jehovah was taken up by his left hand, the head of the family addresses him: "My lord the high-priest, raise thy left hand." He placed them [the lots] on the two he-goats, and uttered: "To Jehovah a sin-offering." R. Ishmael says: It was not necessary for him to say "sin-offering," but "to Jehovah" sufficed. They responded: "Blessed be the name of His kingdom's glory for ever."

GEMARA: Why had he to shake the box? That he should not have intentionally taken that for Jehovah in his right hand (as it was a good omen if he took it up by chance). Rabh said: The box was of wood, and was not sacred, and could contain only the two palms of the hand. Rabbina opposed: It is right that it had only capacity for the two palms, that he might not intentionally take the lot for the Lord; but if it was profane, he should have sanctified it? The answer is: If he had sanctified it, it would have been a wooden sacred vessel, and in the Temple wooden sacred vessels were not used. Let them have made it of silver or gold? Because the Torah wished to spare the wealth of Israel. The Mishna is at variance with the Tana of the following Boraitha: R. Jehudah says in the name of R. Eliezer: The Segan and the high-priest both placed their hands in the box. When that for Jehovah was picked up by the high-priest, the Segan said to him: "My lord the high-priest, raise thy right hand." But if it was picked up by the Segan, the chief of the family said to him: "Speak thy words." Why not the Segan himself? The lot came into the hand of the Segan, and

not of the high-priest; therefore the spirits of the latter would have been depressed. On what point do they differ? One thinks, the right hand of the Segan is better than the left hand of the high-priest, and therefore both should put into the box their right hand; whereas the other thinks that the left hand of the high-priest is as good as the right hand of the Segan, and therefore he ought to place both his hands in the box. And who is the Tana who differs from R. Jehudah? That is R. Hanina, the Segan of the priests. As we have learned in the following Boraitha: R. Hanina the Segan of the priests said: Why did the Segan ever walk on the right of the high-priest? In case the high-priest became unfit for service, the Segan should enter at once to do the service.

The rabbis taught: In the time of the forty years during which Simeon the Upright was high-priest, the lot for Jehovah always came into the high-priest's right hand, but thereafter it sometimes fell into his right, sometimes into his left hand. And the tongue of crimson wool, during the time of Simeon the Upright, always became white. But after Simeon the Upright, sometimes it became white, sometimes it remained red. In Simeon the Upright's time the western light ever burned, but after him it sometimes burned and sometimes went out. The fire of the altar ever waxed in strength, and except the two measures of wood prescribed they had not to add any wood, in Simeon the Upright's time; but after him, sometimes the fire persisted and sometimes wood had to be added. In his time a blessing was sent into the Omer, the two loaves of bread, and the show-bread, and every priest who received only the size of an olive became satiated, and some was left over; but after him, these things were cursed, and every priest got only the size of a bean. And the delicate priests refused to take it altogether, but the voracious ones accepted and consumed. It once happened, one took his own share and his fellow's: he was nicknamed "robber" till his death.

The rabbis taught: The year when Simeon the Upright had to die, he told the sages: "Children, know ye that this year I am going to die." They asked him: "How dost thou know?" He said: "Every year when I entered and left the Holy of Holies, I was accompanied by one old man, dressed in white and enveloped in white; but this year it was an old man attired in black and in a black turban, and he entered with me but did not go out with me." And after the festivals, he got sick, and died.

And thenceforth priests ceased to bless Israel with the name of Jehovah, but used "Adonai" (the Lord).

The rabbis taught: Forty years before the Temple was destroyed, the lot never came into the right hand, the red wool did not become white, the western light did not burn, and the gates of the Temple opened of themselves, till the time that R. Johanan b. Zakkai rebuked them, saying: "Temple, Temple, why alarmest thou us? We know that thou art destined to be destroyed. For of thee hath prophesied Zechariah ben Iddo [Zech. xi. 1]: 'Open thy doors, O Lebanon, and the fire shall eat thy cedars.'"

"*He placed them on the two he-goats.*" The rabbis taught: Six times the high-priest pronounced God's name, as it is written (Jehovah), during the Day of Atonement: three times in the first confession and three times in the second confession, and the seventh time when he had drawn the lot. It happened, when the high-priest said, "I beseech thee, Jehovah," his voice was heard in Jericho, ten *Parsas* distant from Jerusalem, according to Rabba bar bar Hana. And the sound of opening the Temple gates was heard at the distance of eight legal limits of Sabbath (16,000 ells). The goats that were in Jericho used to sneeze at the incense offered at Jerusalem. A bride in Jerusalem had never to perfume herself, as the odor of the incense imbued them all with aromatic smells. R. Joel b. Diglai said: My father had goats on the mountains of Michmar. They sneezed at the incense. R. Hiya b. Abbin said in the name of R. Joshua b. Kar'ha: A certain old man has related to me, that since the time when he was walking in Shiloh, he still felt the smell of its formerly offered incense.

R. Janai said: To take out the lots from the box was obligatory, but to place them on the goats was not so. R. Johanan says: Even taking them out was not obligatory. An objection was made from the following Boraitha: The disciples asked R. Aqiba, If the lot came into his left hand, might he not put it into his right hand? He replied: Do not give the Sadducees opportunity to rebel (by declaring it unbiblical). Now here the reason is only that the Sadducees should not rebel; but otherwise, we would say, he may transfer it from one hand to the other. How, then, can R. Janai say that it was obligatory? Then the lots would not be changeable. Said Rabba: They mean to say, not that he may transfer the lot in his left hand to his right hand, but that when the lot has been placed on the

goat for Azazel, whether he may transfer him to his right; and design him for the Lord? The answer to this was: Although one may use a thing appointed to a less holy purpose for a more holy, yet the Sadducees will rebel.

MISHNA: He tied a tongue of crimson wool to the head of the goat that was to be sent away [the scapegoat], and placed him opposite to the gate through which he was to be transferred; and the one to be slaughtered, opposite to the place of its slaughtering. He went to his bull a second time, putting his hands on him, and confessing in these terms: "I beseech thee, Jehovah, I have committed iniquities, transgressed, and sinned before Thee, I and my house, and the sons of Aaron, Thy holy people: I beseech Thee, Jehovah, forgive the iniquities, transgressions, and sins which I have committed, transgressed, and sinned, I and my house, and the sons of Aaron, Thy holy people, as it is written in the Torah of Moses Thy servant: 'For on that day shall he make atonement for you, to cleanse you from all your sins, that ye may be pure before Jehovah.'" They respond after him: "Blessed is the name of His kingdom's glory forever."

GEMARA: The schoolmen propounded a question: The Mishna states: He was placed opposite to the gate, and the one to be slaughtered opposite to the slaughtering-place. Were they to be tied in their places, or only placed there? Come and hear! R. Joseph taught: He tied a tongue of crimson wool to the head of the goat that was to be sent away, and placed him opposite to the gate, and the one to be slaughtered opposite to the slaughtering-place, for the purpose that they should not be confounded with one another, as with other goats. Now, if the Mishna means they were tied there, it is right; but if only placed, this can only prevent their being confounded with each other, as the one has the tongue of red wool tied to it, but with other goats the other may be confounded? It is meant, then, that they should be tied in their places.

R. Itz'hak said: I have heard a Halakha about two tongues of wool, one for the red cow and the other for the scapegoat, that one must be of a prescribed quantity and the other need not, and I do not know which it is. Said R. Joseph: Let us see. The wool for the goat which was sent away must be divided into two parts: one part tied to its horns, and one to the rack; therefore it seems that it must be of a prescribed quantity. But the wool for the red cow, which need not be divided, need be of no prescribed quantity. Rami b. Hama opposed: Even that for

the red cow must have a certain weight (as will be explained). Rabha answered him: Concerning the weight, the opinions of the Tanaim are different; consequently, no prescribed quantity is needed. When R. Dimi came from Palestine, he said in the name of R. Johanan: I have heard of three tongues of wool: one for the red cow, one for the scapegoat, and one for lepers. I have heard, one must be of the weight of 10 Zuz, one must have the weight of 2 Selas, and one of 1 Shekel, but I cannot explain which. When Rabbin came from Palestine, he explained this in the words of R. Jonathan: That for the red cow must weigh 10 Zuz, for the scapegoat 2 Selas, and for lepers 1 Shekel. (For the red cow, which must have a certain weight, it is 10 Zuz; that of the goat, which must be divided, 2 Selas; and the leper's, which need be neither, it is a Shekel.)

R. Itz'hak said: I have heard about the two slaughterings, of the red cow and of the high-priest's bull, one, if done by a layman, is valid, and the other is, in such a case, invalid; but I cannot explain which it is. It was taught: Concerning the slaughtering of the red cow and the high-priest's bull, Rabh and Samuel differed. One said, if the red cow was slaughtered by a layman, it is valid, and the bull, invalid; and the other says the reverse.

It may be ascertained that Rabh is the one who says that the red cow slaughtered by a layman is invalid, because (when Rabh heard) R. Zerah said that the red cow slaughtered by a layman is invalid, Rabh said: The reason is, that in connection with the red cow is mentioned Elazar (a priest) and "statute."

It was taught: Concerning the slaughtering of the red cow by a layman, R. Ammi said: It is valid; R. Itz'hak of Naph'ha said: It is invalid; Ulla said: It is valid; and others say: It is invalid. R. Joshua b. Abba objected to the statement that it is valid, and wanted to support Rabh from the following Boraitha: It is certain to us that the sprinkling of the water of the red cow is invalid, if a woman has done it instead of a man, or when it was not sprinkled in the daytime. But whence do we deduce further that the slaughtering of it, and receiving of the blood, and sprinkling of the blood, and burning it, and the putting in of the cedar-wood, hyssop, scarlet string, is invalid in such cases? Therefore it is written, "The law."

Shall we assume that to them shall be added the gathering of the ashes, and the drawing of the water, and the *sanctification*? Therefore it is written: "This" is the statute [Num. xix. 2].

But what is the reason of including those, and excluding these ? Because we find here an extension and a limitation, we will say that we may deduce all the ceremonies from the sprinkling of the water. As the sprinkling of the water must be done by a male, not by a female, and is valid only in the daytime, we may add to it the slaughtering, the receiving and sprinkling of the blood, the burning, putting in of cedar-wood, hyssop, a scarlet string ; as it is certain to us that all these things are invalid when done by a female, so we conclude it is valid only in the daytime ; and we will exclude the gathering of the ashes, the drawing of the water, and the *sanctification*, as they may be done by a female, so we will conclude they may be done also in the night-time. What is the objection ? If you will say: " Because it is prohibited to a female, it is also prohibited to a layman," you can infer from the sprinkling of the water, which is invalid when done by a female, but nevertheless is valid when done by a layman. Said Abayi: The objection is this, What is the reason that a female may not sprinkle it ? Because it is written " Elazar," and we say Elazar, but not a woman. In the same manner, we say Elazar (*i.e.*, a priest), but not a layman. Said Ulla: If you will read carefully the whole section about the red cow, you will see that one case cannot be compared with the other. Some apparently analogous inferences are yet in reality contradictory. And there are apparently analogous inferences which are really analogous. (Therefore care must be taken in making inferences.) Said R. Assi: (It is so), for when R. Johanan and Resh Lakish learned the section of the red cow, they carried away in their heads no more than a fox does earth when it runs across a ploughed field, for some apparently analogous inferences are really so, and some not.

One Tana taught in the presence of R. Johanan: All slaughtering may be done by a layman, except that of the red cow. Said R. Johanan to him: " Go and teach it outside of the college; for we find no single kind of slaughtering invalid when done by a layman." And R. Johanan not only disregarded this Tana's teaching, but even his own Master's; for R. Johanan said in the name of R. Simeon b. Jehozadak: " The slaughtering of a red cow by a layman is invalid." But I say it is valid, because we do not find any kind of slaughtering invalid when done by a layman.

" *He went to his bull.*" Why did he not say in the first confession, " The sons of Aaron, Thy holy people," but does so in

the second? The disciples of R. Ishmael taught: So is it right according to the law, for it is better that one guiltless should atone for the sinners than that one not yet purified from sins himself should atone for other sinners. (Before the first confession, he was not atoned for himself.)

MISHNA: He slaughtered it [the bull], and received in a basin its blood, giving (presenting) it to him who stirred (mixed) it, on the fourth row of marble stones in the Temple, that it should not become congealed. He took the censer, mounted the top of the altar, and cleared the coals on either hand: taking a censeral of the inner glowing coals, then he came down again, and placed it [the censer] on the fourth row of stones in the forecourt.

Every day he scooped up with a silver censer, and emptied into a golden vessel. On this day he filled a golden censer, and also carried it in. Every day he used to scoop [the coals] up in one measuring 4 Kabs, and poured them into one of 3 Kabs; but on this day he filled one of 3 Kabs, and also carried them in it. R. Jose says: Every day he filled one of a Seah [6 Kabs], and emptied it into one of 3 Kabs; but on this day he filled one of 3 Kabs, and carried them in it.* On all days it was a heavy (massive) one, but on this day he took a light one. Every day its handle was short, on this day long; all days its gold was yellow, but on that day red. This is according to R. Mena'hem. On all days he used to offer half a Mina [50 Dinars in weight] of incense in the morning, and one half in the evening; but on this day added a handful more. Every day it was pounded finely, but on this day it was the finest [Lev. xvi. 12]. On all days priests went up on the eastern staircase [of the altar], and descended on the western. On this day the high-priest went up on the middle one, and came down on the same. R. Jehudah says: The high-priest ever mounts and descends on the middle one. All days the high-priest washed his hands from the laver, and on this day from the golden pitcher [cyathus]. R. Jehudah says: The high-priest ever washes his hands and feet from a golden pitcher. All days there were four fires [on the altar]; on that day five: this is according to R. Meir. R. Jose says:

* The reason is, because the coals must be live coals, so as to give a flame. As the top ones become somewhat dull, he drops them on the floor and only the middle ones are used. They differ, however, as to the measure of coals extinguished. According to the rabbis, no more than one quarter of the amount extinguishes, while according to R. Jose about one half extinguishes.

TRACT YOMAH (DAY OF ATONEMENT). 65

Every day three, and on this day four. R. Jehudah says: Every day two, on this day three.

GEMARA: The Mishna states: He gave it to one who stirred it, on the fourth row of the marble stones. Is it not written [Lev. xvi. 17]: "And there shall not be any man in the tabernacle"? Said R. Jehudah: Read not "of the Temple," but "from the Temple"—the fourth row of stones away from the Temple.

The rabbis taught: It is written: "There shall not be any man in the tabernacle." Shall we assume, that one may not be in the corridors either? Therefore it is written, "in the tabernacle" (but outside one may). All this has been said of the tabernacle in Shiloh. How is it known that it applied also to the Temple in Jerusalem? Therefore it is written [ibid.], "in the holy place." All this is said of the time when he offers the incense. How is it known that when he sprinkles the blood no man should be in the holy place either? Therefore it is written, "when he goeth in." But how is it known that no man is to be found there till he comes out? Because it is written, "until he come out." After that it is written, "shall he make an atonement for himself, and for his household, and for the whole congregation of Israel"; from this is seen that first he must atone for himself, then for his household, then for the priests, and then for Israel.

The Master says: It only applies to the time when he offers the incense. Whence is this inferred? Said Rabba, and so said also R. Itz'hak b. R. Dimi, and also R. Elazar: It is written: "He shall make an atonement for himself, for his household, and for the whole congregation of Israel." What atones for all these at once? Only the incense. But how is it known that incense atones at all? Yea, for R. Hanania has taught: How is it known that incense atones? Because it is written [Num. xvii. 12]: "And he put on the incense, and made an atonement for the people." And the disciples of R. Ishmael have taught: For what does the incense atone? Slander. Why? Slander is (quietly) done, so incense is (quietly) offered.

"*Every day he scooped up with a silver censer,*" etc. What is the reason (why not a golden one)? Because the Torah has been sparing of Israel's wealth.

"*On this day he filled a golden censer,*" etc. Why did he not do on this day as on all days? Because of the high-priest's weakness (from fasting).

"One measuring four Kabs," etc. We have learned in a Boraitha: If one Kab of coals was spilled on the ground, he swept them into the trench. In one Boraitha we have learned one Kab, and in another, two Kabs? It is right, *one*. This is according to the rabbis, who say he emptied one of four Kabs into one of three; but this is neither according to the rabbis nor R. Jose (according to whom *three* Kabs were left over). Said R. Hisda: The Boraitha is according to R. Ishmael the son of R. Johanan b. Beroqa of the following Boraitha, who says that he carried them into the Holy of Holies only in a censer of *two* Kabs. R. Ashi says this Boraitha can be according to R. Jose, and can be explained thus: Every day he used one of a *Seah* of the desert, which is one-sixth less than a *Seah* of Jerusalem, and emptied it into one of three Jerusalem *Seahs*.

"It was a massive one," etc. We have learned in a Boraitha: On all days its sides were thick, but on that day thin. Every day the handle was short, and this day long? That the high-priest should not need to make such an effort to hold it.

In another Boraitha we have learned: Every day the censer was without a bell, and on this day with a bell ("His sounds shall be heard when he goeth in into the holy place" [Exod. xxviii. 38], since he carried it in in his white garments devoid of bells), so said the son of the Segan.

"The gold was yellow," etc. Said R. Hisda: Seven kinds of gold there are: Gold, and good gold, gold of Ophir, best gold [Muphaz], beaten gold [Sha'hut], pure gold [Sagur], and gold of Parvaim. Gold and good gold, as it is written [Gen. ii. 12]: "And the gold of that land is good"; gold of Ophir, which comes from Ophir; best gold, which is scintillating [1 Kings x. 18]; beaten gold, which is ductile like wire; pure gold—when this gold is exhibited all other wares are locked up; that of Parvaim is like blood of bulls in redness. R. Ashi says: There were only five, only there was gold of each kind of good and bad quality; hence "gold" and "good gold" are deducted. We have learned also in a Boraitha: All days the gold was yellow; this day it was of Parvaim, which is red like the blood of a cow.

"Finely pounded, but this day finest." The rabbis taught (whence do we deduce this?): Because it is already written [Ex. xxx. 36]: "Thou shalt pound some of it fine." Why has it to be repeated, "finely pounded"? That means, on this day it must be finest.

"*Washed his hands from the laver, on this day from the golden pitcher.*" Why so? For the honor of the high-priest.

"*All days there were four fires,*" etc. The rabbis taught: All days were two, this day three; namely, one, the ordinary large fire, the second for the incense, one for this special day (for the extra incense of the Holy of Holies). So says R. Jehudah. R. Jose says: All days were three, this day four; namely, those enumerated by R. Jehudah, and one to keep the fire perpetual, as it is written: "A perpetual fire shall be burning upon the altar, it shall not go out" [Lev. vi. 6], and one specially for this day. Rabbi says: "On all days four, this day five." The four above mentioned, and one for the unconsumed sacrifices which had not yet been burned in the evening.

Now, we see that all agree that this day a special fire was made. Whence do they deduce this? From the expression, "and the fire" [ibid. 5]. And even he who does not deduce it from the "and," deduces it from "and the." What? As we have learned in the following Boraitha: It is written, "a perpetual fire, it shall not go out." This is to teach that the second fire shall be on the outer altar. But how do we know there had to be fires for the censer and lamps? Therefore it is written, "perpetual fire shall be burning on the altar, it shall not be extinguished." This signifies, the perpetual fire of the lamps which, I have taught you, shall be taken only from the outer altar. From this we know that on the altar must be kept fire for the lamps, but whence do we deduce that fire for the incense must be kept also? Therefore it is written [Lev. xvi. 12]: "He shall take a censer full of burning coals of fire from off the altar, from before the Lord." When do we find an altar which was partly before the Lord, and partly away *from* the Lord? We must say that was the outer altar, which was in part outside in the forecourt.

R. Elazar said in the name of Bar Qapara: R. Meir said, if members of the burnt-offering were left from the day before, he made a separate fire, and had them consumed, even on Sabbath. What does he come to teach us? We have learned in the Mishna that there were four fires? Said R. Abhin: He informs us, that even the members of a burnt-offering which had become invalid, were burnt by a separate fire, provided that they had been already attacked by the fire of the day before, but not those not touched by the fire. This we have also learned in the Mishna; namely, this day five? Says R. A'ha b. Jacob: He had to teach this to

us. We might think all this applies to a Day of Atonement which falls on a Sunday, as we had learned somewhere else, that the fat left over from Sabbath should be burnt on the Day of Atonement next to it; but we might think, if it fell on other days of the week he had not to do so. Therefore he tells us.

Says Rabba: Who is this man, that hears not what he speaks ? In the Mishna it is said: " Every day." So it is all days of the week. The objection remains.

It was taught: If one extinguishes the fire of the censer, and of the lamps, Abayi says he is culpable. Rabba says: He is guiltless. If he has taken it from the altar to light it and has dropped it on the ground, and it is extinguished, all agree, he is not culpable; but if he took it from off the altar, and extinguished it there, Abayi says he is culpable, since it is the fire of the altar, of which it is written, " It shall not go out." Rabba says he is guiltless: the moment he has removed it from the altar, the fire is not regarded any more as that of the altar. Now, what R. Na'hman has said in the name of Rabba b. Abahu, that he who has taken a coal from the altar, and extinguished it, is culpable, will be neither according to Abayi nor to Rabba ? What comparison is there ? In that case he took it for a religious purpose, to light the lamp, or so, and it was extinguished, but in this case he removed a coal and extinguished it wantonly.

CHAPTER V.

REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE REMAINING SERVICES OF THE HIGH-PRIEST ON THIS DAY IN THE TIMES OF THE FIRST AND SECOND TEMPLES.

MISHNA: They brought to him a [golden] spoon and censer: he took two handfuls [of incense] and filled the spoon with it. If he had a large hand, it was much; otherwise, it was a little: he used the hand as the measure. He took the censer in his right hand, and the spoon in his left hand.

GEMARA: In a Boraitha we have learned: They brought him an empty spoon from the chamber of the utensils, and a censer full of incense from the chamber of Beth Abtinas.

"He took two handfuls." What was the spoon needed for on the Day of Atonement? It is written [Lev. xvi. 12] merely, "both his hands full of incense, and bring it within the rail"? He could not dispense with a spoon. If he had carried in the censer first, and thereafter the incense, he would carry in twice, and it is written "bring in" only once? If he should take the incense in both his hands, and put the censer upon them, and carry them in at once, what should he do then? Take off the censer with his teeth, and put it down? If it would be unbecoming to do so in presence of a human king, how much more in presence of the King of Kings, the Holy One, blessed be He? Therefore it is impossible, and he is to do as the princes [Num. vii. 14], "One spoon . . . full of incense."

"He took the censer in his right hand," etc. Shall the citizen be seated on the ground, and the stranger on the heaven of heavens? ("The spoon of incense in his *left* hand," etc.) The spoon is small, and more easily carried in the left hand, while the large censer is borne in the right hand. And if they should be equally heavy, as occurred to R. Ishmael b. Qim'hith, who is said to have taken two handfuls of four Kabs of incense, even he had to take the censer in his right hand, as the censer was hot (and he had to be more careful).

It was said of R. Ishmael, the son of Qim'hith: It once hap-

pened on the Day of Atonement he spoke in a public place with an Arab, whose saliva was sprinkled on the high-priest's clothes. He became unclean (as the Arab might be so). Then his brother Jeshohab entered and took his place, so his mother saw two high-priests of her sons the same day. Another day it happened that he spoke with a Gentile nobleman, and the same happened. Then Joseph his brother took his place. And the rabbis taught: Seven sons had Qim'hith, their mother, and all officiated as high-priests. When the sages asked her: How hast thou deserved it? She replied: The ceiling of my house never looked on my hair. The sages answered: Many did so, and it did not profit them.

The rabbis taught: It is written [Lev. vi. 8]: "He shall lift up from it his handful." We might think, his hand might be overfilled; it is therefore written, "his hand *full*," not more. We might think, he may take some with the tips of his fingers. Therefore it is written, "hand *full*." He should bend his three middle fingers on his palm, and remove with the extreme finger and thumb the incense found outside of the three. This was one of the difficult services in the Temple.

R. Johanan said: R. Joshua b. Uza'ah propounded a question, What is the matter with the incense between the middle fingers? Is it considered as belonging to the handful, or the overflow? He himself, said R. Johanan, decided later that it is doubtful. What, then, shall he do therewith? Says R. Hanina: First he should offer the handful, and then this; for if he offered this first, perhaps it is superfluous: and elsewhere we have learned that if the remains of a meal-offering have been lost before the handful was offered, the handful must not be brought.

R. Papa propounded a question: These handfuls, were they exactly measured according to the hand, or too full? Said R. Abbi to R. Ashi: Come and hear the following Boraitha: The handfuls were not exactly according to the measure of the hand, nor overfull, but middling.

R. Papa propounded another question: When the incense happened to be spilled by him, how is the law? Shall it be said, his hand is like the neck of an animal, and the incense is invalid (if the blood has been received from the throat, it is valid, but not if spilled on the ground), or shall we say his hand is like other utensils of the Temple, and if it had been spilled, it may yet be offered? This question is not decided.

The schoolmen asked R. Shesheth: If he had taken the blood

with his left hand, and placed it on the altar, is it valid, or invalid? He answered: We have learned it in our Mishna, that he took the spoon in his left hand (and yet it was offered). An objection was raised: We have learned in a Boraitha: "A layman, a mourner on the first day, a drunkard, and one who has a blemish, if one of these has received the blood, or carried it to the altar, or sprinkled it, he makes it invalid. The same is the case if he did it sitting, or with his left hand." This objection remains.

R. Papa propounded a question: If his companion took two handfuls, and emptied them into the priest's hands, how is the law? Shall we say, he has two handfuls, and it is valid, or shall we say, since it is written, "he shall take, and bring," it is invalid? This question is not decided. R. Joshua b. Levi propounded a question: When he had filled his hands with incense, and suddenly died, how then? Can another take it out from his hands and bring it in, or is other incense required? R. Hanina said: Come and see what kind of questions our predecessors have asked. Was R. Joshua b. Levi older than R. Hanina? Did not R. Joshua b. Levi say that R. Hanina had given me the permission to drink a beverage of *cress* on Sabbath? (See Sabbath, Mishna, p. 226.) He means, R. Hanina asked a profound question like to those asked by the ancestors. How is the law? Come and hear: "That was the measure." From this we must infer, that as the measure was outside, so it must be inside (that priest has a different hand, hence other incense is to be taken).

Perhaps the Mishna means to say that he may use his hand as a measure, or that he may not add to it or take away from what he has grasped? Come and hear: How did he do it (empty the frankincense from the spoon into his hands, both of which were occupied)? He took the handle of the *spoon* with his finger-tips—others say, in his teeth—and moved his thumbs up the handle (being thus able not to spill the frankincense) till the handle fell, near his armpits, and the *head* of the spoon was above his palms. He then overturned the spoon, thus emptying the frankincense thence into his hands, and heaped the frankincense on the censer, that the smoke might be retarded; some say, he spread it out that it should smoke more rapidly.

This was one of the most difficult services of the difficult services that were in the Temple. Hence we see, he took of the frankincense once two handfuls, and then once more.

The schoolmen propounded a question: If he died while

slaughtering, might the blood be sprinkled? Shall we say, that since it is written "with a bullock," it is meant, the blood of the bullock alone, or the whole bull (so that the substitute cannot use him)? R. Hanina says, the entire bullock; Resh Lakish says, the blood alone. Said R. Papa: The hide and the flesh and the dung, all agree, are only parts of the bull; about the blood they differ. One says, the blood is not the bull; the other thinks the blood only is the bull. Says R. Ashi: It seems to me, the one who says that the blood is considered as one with the bull is in the right. Because it is written [Lev. xvi. 3], "With this shall Aaron come into the holy place: with a young bullock," is it meant that he should lead him by the horns? and not simply that he should bring the blood; hence the blood is considered as one with the bullock. And what can the other reply to this? His answer is: It is written, "for a sin-offering"; the word "come" refers, not to the bullock, but to the sin-offering. Let him who says that the blood is one with the bull, give the reason that a sin-offering whose owner has died cannot be used for any purpose, and is only put to death.

Said Rabbin b. R. Adda to Rabba: Thy disciples have said in the name of R. Amram that this bullock is considered a sin-offering for the congregation (who are considered its owners, because he comes to atone for himself and for his fellow-priests), and such is not put to death.

MISHNA: He walked through the Temple till he reached the place between the two vails which separated the sanctuary from the Holy of Holies—one ell wide. R. Jose says: There was but one vail, as it is said [Ex. xxxi. 33]: "And the vail shall divide unto you between the holy place and the most holy."

GEMARA: Did not R. Jose say very correctly to the rabbis? The rabbis may say: This was only the case in the tabernacle, but as in the second Temple there was no ell for the entrance at all (because a partition only an ell thick could not support itself, for the walls of the Temple were a hundred ells high) and only in the first, it was doubted whether this ell of the entrance belonged to the Holy of Holies or the sanctuary. Therefore they made two vails.

The rabbis taught: He walked between the altar and the lamps, so said R. Jehudah. R. Meir says, between the table and the altar. Others say, he walked between the table and the walls. Who are the others? That is R. Jose, who says the

door of the Temple was in the north. R. Jehudah says the door was in the south.

R. Jose says that he walked between the table and wall, which is a public entrance, because the Israelites are a people beloved by God, and need no delegate to pray for them (as it is written [I Kings viii. 38]: "When they shall be conscious every man of the plague of his own heart, and he shall then spread forth his hands"), therefore their delegate to God needed no private entrance, but could do it in sight of the public.

R. Nathan said: The ell of the entrance was a matter of doubt to the sages, whether it was holy as the Holy of Holies or the sanctuary, and that is what R. Johanan has said: Joseph the man of Hutzal has propounded a question: It is written [I Kings vi. 19]: "And the Debir in the house *within* did he prepare, to set therein the ark of the covenant of the Lord." They did not know what is meant: whether the place inside of the Debir was prepared for the ark, or that the Debir was itself inside.

MISHNA: The outer one was raised and looked to the southern [wall] and the inner one to the northern. He walked between them, till he reached the northern [wall]: having arrived thither, he turned his face to the south, he walked back with his left hand to the curtain, reaching the ark [which was on his right in the Holy of Holies, reaching the place where the inner curtain was]. Coming there, he placed the censer between the staves, heaped the incense on the top of the coals, so that the whole house was filled with smoke. He departed in the same manner as he had come [facing the Holy of Holies, walking backward], and said a short prayer in the outer sanctuary, but not making it a long one, so as not to alarm the Israelites [about his absence, lest he had been killed by God].

GEMARA: Of which Temple is it spoken? In the first Temple there was a partition, not a curtain, before the ark; if the second, there was no ark in it? As we have learned in the following Boraitha: Since the ark was concealed, with it were hidden the flask of manna [Ex. xvi. 33] and the flask of anointing oil, Aaron's staff, its almonds and buds, and the box the Philistines sent as a gift to the God of Israel with the golden vessels. And who concealed them? King Josiah. Why? Because it is written [Deut. xxviii. 36]: "The Lord will drive thee and thy king whom thou wilt set over thee," he concealed it; as it is written [2 Chron. xxxv. 3]: "And he said unto the Levites that

instructed all Israel, who were holy men unto the Lord: Set the holy ark in the house which Solomon the son of David the King of Israel did build; ye have not to carry it any more upon your shoulders: now serve the Lord your God, and His people Israel." And R. Eliezer said to this: From the analogy of expression—namely, that of the ark—it is said "there" [Ex. xxx.], and of the flask of manna also "there" [ibid. xvii.]; and there are also mentioned "generations" and "for preservation." R. Eliezer infers that Josiah concealed them. There was then no ark? The second Temple is meant; and not the ark, but the place where it had to stand, is meant. But it is said, "between the two staves." The place they would occupy is meant.

"*Heaped the incense on the top of the coals.*" Our Mishna will agree with him who has said in a Boraitha: Heap it, that the issue of the smoke be retarded (made slow). In one Boraitha we have learned: He heaps it inside, away from him. In another Boraitha: He heaps it outside, toward himself. How will they agree? Says Abayi: There is a difference of opinion between two Tanaim; one says one way, the other, otherwise. Abayi says again: It seems to me the Halakha is according to him who says that he must heap it inside, away from himself; because, as we have further learned in a Mishna, they teach him not to heap near his face, lest he burn himself.

The rabbis taught: It is written [Lev. xvi. 13]: "He shall put the incense upon the fire, before the Lord." "Before the Lord": he must not prepare it outside, but inside, in the Holy of Holies. This is to contradict the Sadducees, who said that he must prepare outside. Why? Because, they say, it is written [ibid. 2]: "For in the cloud will I appear upon the mercy-seat." Cloud is interpreted, the cloud of the incense. When he prepares outside, he enters with a cloud of incense. The sages said to the Sadducees: Is it not written: "He shall put the incense upon the fire *before the Lord*"? So it has to be prepared inside. They rejoined: What will you make of the "cloud"? The rabbis say: From this we deduce that he must put in the herb which straightens the smoke. How is it known that that herb has to be put in? Because it is written [ibid. 13]: "That the cloud of the incense may envelop." Without that herb, how will the mercy-seat be enveloped? If he has omitted to put in this herb or any ingredient, he is liable to capital punishment. Why give this reason, when, if he come in without the incense being entirely prepared, he enters the Holy of Holies

gratuitously, which involves capital punishment? Says R. Shesheth: The case is, he had omitted one ingredient intentionally, but entered unintentionally. R. Ashi says: Even if he did both things intentionally, but entered with two kinds of incense, one kind prepared as is lawful and the other not, for entering he is not culpable, but for having prepared incense lacking some ingredient he deserves capital punishment.

"He departed in the same manner as he had come." Whence do we deduce this? Said R. Shama b. Na'hmain in the name of R. Jonathan: It is written [2 Chron. i. 13]: "Then came Solomon from the high place that was at Gibeon to Jerusalem" (literally, *at*). How comes Gibeon to be in Jerusalem? His return from Gibeon to Jerusalem is compared to his entering Gibeon from Jerusalem. As when he entered Gibeon from Jerusalem his face was turned to the high place, so when he left it, his face was still turned to the high place. So did also the priests after service, the Levites after their song, and the Israelites after they had been standing. When they left, their countenances were turned to the Temple. So also a disciple, leaving his Master, should do. So R. Elazar, when he used to part from Johanan. When R. Johanan desired to leave first, he bent himself in his place till Johanan was out of his sight; when R. Elazar was to leave first, he walked backwards till he could see him no longer. Rabba, leaving R. Joseph (who was blind), used to walk backwards till his feet struck against the threshold, so as to cause them to bleed. When this was related to R. Joseph, he said to Rabba: May God's will be that you shall raise your head above the whole city. R. Alexandri said in the name of R. Joshuah b. Levi: Who prays, should make three steps backwards, and then say, "Maketh peace," etc. Said R. Mordecai to him: If he has made three steps backwards, he must stop there a while. It is like a disciple who has taken farewell of his Master, and then returns to him on the instant, which is like a dog returning to his vomit. If he has failed in doing so, he would better not have prayed at all. In the name of Shemaia it has been said: When he says these words, he should first bow to the right, then to the left; as it is written [Deut. xxx. 2]: "From his right hand a fiery law." Rabha saw Abayi, who said "He maketh peace" first on the right, and then on his left. He said to him: Thinkest thou, thou must say this to the right side of thyself? nay, of the Holy One, blessed be He, who is opposite to thee and whose right side thus corresponds to thy left side. R. Hiya the son of R. Huna

said: I saw Abayi and Rabha making the three steps backwards with one bow.

"And said a short prayer." What was the prayer? Rabba and Rabbin the sons of R. Adda both said in the name of Rabh: May it be Thy will, Lord our God, that if this year will be a hot one, Thou mayest give plenty of rain. R. A'ha the son of Rabha said in the name of R. Jehudah that the high-priest used to conclude the prayer as follows: May no ruler cease from the house of Judah, and may Thy people Israel not depend for livelihood on each other (not be paupers), and mayest Thou not heed the prayers of travellers who ask for the cessation of rain.

R. Hanina Dasa happened to be on the road. It began to rain. He said: Lord of the Universe, the whole world enjoys, but Hanina is afflicted. The rain ceased. When he reached home, he said: The whole world is in anxiety because no rain comes, only Hanina is contented (having no fields). Rain began to come again.

Says R. Joseph: What availed the prayer of the high-priest against the prayer of R. Hanina Dasa?

The rabbis taught: It happened that one high-priest made his prayer very long. When the priests became alarmed, they went to see whether he had died, and met him returning. They inquired of him why he had made his prayer so long. He said: Is this displeasing to you, when I prayed the Lord that the Temple might not be destroyed? They said to him: Do not thou repeat it, as we have learned in the Mishna, "He should not make the prayer long, lest he alarm the congregation."

MISHNA: When the ark had been taken away, there was a stone from the time of the first prophets, "Shethia" [foundation] it was called, three-finger high above the ground. Thereupon he placed [the censer]. He took the blood from the one who stirred it, went to the place whither he had gone, and stopped where he had stopped [in the Holy of Holies], and sprinkled from his position once upward and seven times downward [Lev. xvi. 14], without being intent on sprinkling it either upward or downward, but holding the palm open, either turned outward or toward himself [meaning doubtful]. Thus he was counting: one [upward], one and one [downward], one and two, one and three, one and four, one and five, one and six, one and seven. He departed, and placed it [the basin] on the golden stand in the Temple. They brought to him the he-goat, he slaughtered it, and received in a basin its blood. He went to

the former place, stopping where he had stopped, and sprinkled thereof once upward, and seven times downward, without taking care to sprinkle upward or downward, but holding his palm open, turned in or out, and counting thus: one, one and one, one and two, etc. He came out, and placed it on the second stand that was in the Temple. R. Jehudah saith: There was but one stand there. He took up the bull's blood, and put down the he-goat's blood. He sprinkled thereof at the curtain which was opposite to the ark outside, once upward, and seven times down, without taking care, etc., and thus counting, etc. He lifted the blood [-filled basin] of the he-goat, and put down that of the bull's blood; he sprinkled of it on the curtain opposite to the ark outside, once upward, seven times down, etc. He emptied the bull's blood into the he-goat's blood, and transferred (the contents of) the filled basin into the empty one.

GEMARA: The Mishna says, "When the ark was taken away," not *concealed*; it holds, therefore, that it was removed to Babylon. As we have learned in a Boraitha, R. Eliezer said: The ark was taken into exile in Babylonia. As it is written [2 Chron. xxxvi. 10]: "And with the expiration of the year did King Nebuchadnezzar send, and had him brought to Babylon, with the precious vessels of the house of the Lord" (precious; that is, the ark). R. Simeon b. Jochai infers this from another passage [Is. xxxix. 6]: "No thing shall be left": no word (for "thing," "word," and "commandment" the same Hebrew word is here used) will be left, none of the ten commandments (or the ark which contained them). R. Jehudah, however, says: The ark was concealed in its place (Temple), as it is written [1 Kings viii. 8]: "And they had made the staves so long, that the ends of the staves were seen out in the holy place in the front of the Debir, but they were not seen without; *and they have remained there until this day.*" And he who says that R. Simeon b. Jochai thinks that the ark was taken into exile, differs from Ulla, who says as follows: R. Mathia b. Heresh had asked R. Simeon b. Jochai in Rome: We see that R. Eliezer infers from two verses that the ark was taken into exile. One verse is quoted above; the other is [Lam. i. 6]: "There is gone forth from the daughter of Zion all her splendor." Thereby the ark is meant. What hast thou to say thereto? He replied: I say, the ark was concealed on the spot, and the proof is the verse quoted above. Said R. Na'hman b. Itz'hak: We have also learned it in a Mishna in Shekalim [VI., b]: "Once a priest was engaged there, and he

noticed that one of the paving stones on one place appeared different from the others. He went out to tell others of it; but he had not yet finished speaking, when he gave up the ghost. Thereby it was known to a certainty that the ark of the covenant was hidden there." What was he engaged in? Says R. Helbo: He was busy sporting with his axe. The disciples of R. Ishmael have taught: There were two blemished priests who picked out the wood, which was not mouldy. The axe of one fell down on the place where the ark was concealed; a fire issued, which consumed him.

"*A stone, Shethia.*" We have learned in a Boraitha: The word *Shethia* means, that the universe has been created from it, as *Shethia* means *foundation*. This is according to him who says, that from Zion the world began to be created, as we have learned in the following Boraitha: R. Eliezer said: The world was created from the very middle, as it is written [Job xxxviii. 38]: "When the dust is poured out as molten metal, and the clods are made to cleave fast together" (first the central piece was made, then the other parts adhered to it). R. Joshua says: The world was created beginning with the extremities, as it is written [ibid. xxxvii. 6]: "For to the snow he saith, Be thou earth. Likewise to the pouring rain, and to the pouring rains of his strength." Four times the word "rain" is repeated here (in Hebrew, but "rain" means in Talmudic dialect "matter"). There were then four pieces of matter, and of them was composed the world. R. Itz'hak says: The Holy One, blessed be He, threw a stone into the sea, and therefrom a world was made. As it is written [ibid. xxxviii. 6]: "Upon what are her foundation-pillars placed at rest? or who threw her corner-stone?" The sages, however, said: The world was created beginning with Zion. As it is written [Ps. l. 1, 2]: "The God of Gods, the Lord Speaketh," etc. "Out of Zion, the perfection of beauty." That signifies, from Zion began to be the beauty of the whole world. In another Boraitha we have learned: R. Eliezer the Great said, It is written [Gen. ii. 4]: "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created, on the day that the Lord God made earth and heaven." The luminous stars, etc., were created from the heavens, and all earthly things from the earth. But the sages say: Everything was created from Zion. As it is written [Ps. l. 1]: "A Psalm of Assaph. The God of gods," etc. "The perfection of beauty," i.e., the beauty of the whole world.

"*Holding the palm open.*" What is meant by this? Said R. Jehudah: As one uses a lash first from the right to the left, and then downward.

"*He took the blood from the one who stirred it,*" etc. We have learned in a Boraitha: When he sprinkled, he did not sprinkle on the top of the mercy-seat, but opposite; and not that the blood should fall on it, but on the ground. When he sprinkled on the top of the mercy-seat, he bent the palm downward, that it should not fall on the mercy-seat, and when he sprinkled beneath it, he held his palm bent upward, that it should not fall on the mercy-seat, but on the ground. Whence do we deduce this? Because it is written [Lev. xvi. 15]: "He shall sprinkle it above the mercy-seat, and before the mercy-seat." This had not to be written, as it has already been written in the case of the bullock [ibid. 14]. It is meant to make the "before" and "above" equal; as by "before" the mercy-seat, it is meant that it should not be sprinkled at it, but opposite to it; so also by "above" is meant, not upon it, but opposite to it.

The rabbis taught: It is written: "And he shall sprinkle it above the mercy-seat." From this we know only once above (*it*, in case of the goat). How many times had he to sprinkle downward? This we have to infer from the bullock: as it is written of him seven times, so we infer in regard to the he-goat. We know that it is equal in case of the bullock and goat, downward; but we do not know how many times he is to sprinkle downward in case of the bullock? We apply to the bullock the law in reference to the goat: as in the case of the goat, so in the case of the bullock—once downward, seven times upward.

"*One, one and one,*" etc. The rabbis taught: He counted one, one and one, one and two, etc., up to seven. So said R. Meir. R. Jehudah says: One, one and one, two and one, three and one, four and one, five and one, six and one, seven and one. They do not differ. Each said according to the custom in his part of the country (in the one place they said, *e.g.*, twenty-one, in the other one and twenty). Now we see that all agree that the first time of sprinkling had to be counted along with each of the other seven? What is the reason? Said R. Elazar: He should make no mistake in the number of countings. R. Johanan says: Because it is written again [ibid. 14]: ' Shall he sprinkle,' superfluously, it is to teach us that the first he ought to count with all the others. What is the point of their difference?

R. Elazar says: If he has failed to do it, but made no mistake, it is valid; but according to R. Johanan, it is not.

"He departed, and placed it on the golden stand." One of the scholars read the prayer in the presence of Rabha, and read, "He departed, and placed it on the second stand"; and after this he read, "He took the he-goat's blood, and put down the bullock's blood." Said Rabha to him: The first thing thou readest according to the rabbis (who say there were two stands), and the second according to R. Jehudah (who says there was but one stand, and therefore he took down the bullock's blood when he came with the goat's blood), you thus contradict yourself. You should say: He put down the goat's blood (on the second stand), and took up the bullock's blood (from the first stand).

The rabbis taught: It is written [ibid. 16]: "So shall he do for the tabernacle," etc. Wherefore had this to be written? It comes to teach us, that as in the Holy of Holies he had to sprinkle once and seven times, both from the bullock's blood and the goat's, so he had to do in the sanctuary.

"That abideth among them in the midst of their uncleanness." This signifies, even when they were unclean, the Shekhina continued to be among them. A certain Sadducee said to R. Hanina: At the present time, when the Temple is destroyed, ye are certainly unclean, as it is written [Lam. i. 9]: "Her uncleanness on her skirts." He replied to him: Come and see. It is written: "That abideth among them in the midst of their uncleanness."

We have learned in a Boraitha: When he sprinkled on the vail, he sprinkled not upon it, but opposite to it (that the blood fell on the ground). R. Eliezer b. R. Jose, however, said: I have seen on the vail in Rome the marks of the drops of blood of the bullock and goat of the Day of Atonement.

What is the law, when the bloods of the bullock and goat got mingled? What shall he do therewith? Says Rabha: He sprinkled thereof once upward, and seven times downward, and this sufficed for both. This Halakha has been communicated to Jeremiah in Palestine: He said: Ye Babylonians are stupid. Because ye live in a dark land, ye say dark Halakhas. In this manner, he will sprinkle the he-goat's blood before the bullock's, and it is written [Lev. xvi. 20]: "When he hath made an end of atoning for the holy place." "The end"—hence everything must be in its proper turn. What, then, shall he do? Says

TRACT YOMAH (DAY OF ATONEMENT). 81

R. Jeremiah: Once he sprinkles it as the bullock's, and then a second time as the he-goat's blood.

How if the bloods got mixed, when he has already sprinkled the bullock's blood upward? Said Rabha: He should sprinkle it seven times downward as the bullock's, and then upward and downward as the he-goat's, blood. How if he has confounded the basins? What shall he do then? He should sprinkle three times, once for the bullock, then for the he-goat, and the third time for the he-goat (lest the he-goat's blood had preceded the bullock's when he sprinkled the first time).

"*He emptied the bull's blood into the he-goat's.*" Our Mishna will be according to him who maintains that the bloods must be mixed, for the purpose of putting it on the corners of the altar. Because it was taught: R. Joshiah and R. Jonathan said, one of them that they had to be mingled, and the other that they ought not to be mingled, but put separately on the corners of the altar. It seems that R. Joshiah was the one who said they had to be mingled, as we have heard elsewhere, though it is not written "together" [Lev. xvi. 18]; yet since it is written "and," it is as good as though it had been written "together."

We have learned in another Boraitha: It is written: "He shall take from the blood of the bullock and the blood of the he-goat." That signifies, they should be mixed together. But whence do ye know that it means that they should be sprinkled together, not separately? Therefore it is written [Ex. xxx. 10]: "And Aaron shall make an atonement upon its horns once in a year": *once*, not repeatedly. We see that the anonymous Boraitha is according to R. Joshiah.

"*He transferred (the contents of) the filled one into the empty one.*" Rami b. Hama propounded a question of R. Hisda: If he had placed one basin in the other, and therein received the blood, how is it? Should we say, as they are of one kind, that forms no invalidation? or that though of one kind, it is an invalidation? R. Hisda answered him: We have learned it in our Mishna: He has transferred the filled one into the empty one. Shall we not assume that it means, he placed the full basin in the empty one? Nay. It means, he poured the contents of the full basin into the empty one. But this is already mentioned in the beginning of the sentence? He transfers the mixed blood again into an empty vessel, to mix the two kinds of blood the better.

MISHNA: He then went out to the altar which is before the Lord, which is the golden altar, and began to cleanse it, downward. Whence does he begin? From the northeastern corner [horn] to the northwestern, southwestern, southeastern. Where he begins to cleanse the outer altar, at that spot he finishes cleansing the inner. R. Eliezer says he remains where he stands, and thence cleanses [the altar being one ell square]. Everywhere he sprinkled from below upward, except at the spot where he stood, whereat he sprinkled from above downward.

He sprinkled on the clean place of the altar [where the gold was to be seen] seven times, and what remained of the blood he poured at the western base of the outer altar, and what remained of the blood of the outer altar he poured at the southern base. Both kinds of blood mingled in the trench, and flowed out into the brook Kidron. And it was sold to gardeners as manure, but one offends by [using without paying for] them.

GEMARA: We have learned in a Boraitha: Why is it necessary to repeat here, "before the Lord"? Said R. Nehemiah: Because we find that when he held the bloods of the bullock and he-goat he stood inside of the altar, and sprinkled the blood on the vail, we might think that at the same time he should sprinkle on the golden altar: therefore it is written [Lev. iv. 7], "the altar of the incense of spice, before the Lord," to let us know that the altar was before the Lord, but not the priest. What, then, should he do? He had to come out to the outside of the altar, and thence sprinkle.

"Began to cleanse it, downward." The rabbis taught: He began to cleanse from above downward. And whence did he begin? From the southeastern to the southwestern, northwestern, northeastern. So is the decree of R. Aqiba. R. Jose the Galilean said: From the northeastern to the northwestern, southwestern, southeastern. So that at the place where, according to R. Jose, he begins, according to R. Aqiba he finishes, and *vice versa*. Now we see that, according to all, he does not begin with the corner he meets first, but some definite corner. What is the reason? Said Samuel: Because it is written, "He went out to the altar," till he has come out from the place inside of the altar, and comes outside. (What is the point of difference between the two Tanaim?) The following: R. Aqiba thinks he has to walk round the altar, and R. Jose that he ought only to cleanse the altar at all corners, making its round with the *hand*. We have learned in a Boraitha: R. Ishmael said: Two high-

priests remained of the first Temple. One said, he had passed round the altar with his hand; and the other, he had walked round it with his feet. And both gave their reasons. The one said: As it is written, "round." The inner altar was like the outer, which was large, and had to be walked around; while the other said: It was small, and with his hand one could reach all corners, as it was only in size like one corner of the outer altar: hence it was not necessary to walk round it.

"He sprinkled at the clean place of the altar." What is meant by the clean place? Said Rabba b. R. Shila: Where the altar was not covered, as it is written [Ex. xxiv. 10]: "Like the color of heaven in clearness." We have learned in a Boraitha: Hanania says, he sprinkled on the northern side, and R. Jose says, southern. On what point do they differ? The one says the door of the sanctuary was at the north, the other says, at the south; but all agree, that where he finished to put the blood on the corners, at that side he sprinkled on the top. What is the reason? Because it is written [Lev. xvi. 19]: "He shall cleanse it and hallow it." That signifies where he had hallowed it, there he shall cleanse it.

"What remained of the blood," etc. This is because it is written [ibid. iv. 7]: "All the (remaining) blood of the bullock shall he pour out," and when he comes out, he meets the western base of the outer altar first.

"Of the outer altar, he poured at the southern base." The rabbis taught: By the base of the altar, the southern base is meant.

And another Boraitha states that, according to R. Ishmael, it was the western. The disciples of R. Ishmael, however, taught in the name of R. Ishmael, as the disciples of R. Simeon b. Jochai, that it was the southern (that is, R. Ishmael revoked what he said).

"One may offend," etc. The rabbis taught: One becomes guilty, when he uses the blood for his benefit. So is the decree of R. Meir and R. Simeon. The sages, however, said: The blood may be used. They are at variance only as to whether it is rabbinically an offence or not; but all agree that, biblically, one cannot offend (for if they thought it was biblical, they would not sell it to gardeners. *Tosphath.*) Whence do we deduce this? Says Ulla: It is written [Lev. xvii. 11]: "I have appointed it for you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls": for *you*, it should belong to you. The disciples of R. Simeon taught: To make an atonement, but not an offence.

R. Johanan says: In the same verse it is written, "For the blood it is that maketh an atonement for the soul." It is (after the atonement) as it had been before the atonement.

MISHNA: It holds true of all the rites on the Day of Atonement, whose order is prescribed by the Bible (and stated in the above Mishnas), that if they are performed in a wrong order, one has done nothing. Had he used the blood of the he-goat previously to that of the bull, he should sprinkle once more some of that he-goat's blood after that bull's blood, and if while he had not completed the offering of the gifts in the inner part [Holy of Holies], the blood was spilled, it is incumbent upon him to fetch other blood, and once more sprinkle it inside, and the same is the case in the Temple, and also of the golden altar, because all [rites] are separate atonements. R. Elazar and R. Simeon say, however: From where he had been mistaken, he should begin anew.

GEMARA: The rabbis taught: It holds true of all ceremonies of the Day of Atonement whose order is stated in the Mishna, if one of them has been performed earlier than that which should precede it, it is as nothing. R. Jehudah, however, said: This is only true of the rites performed in the white garments in the Holy of Holies, but of the ceremonies performed in the white garments outside (*e.g.*, the lots, emptying the remaining blood, or confessions), it is true that if he has done them out of the right order, they are still valid. R. Nehemiah said: The case is simply, all ceremonies performed not in the right order in the white garments, whether in the Holy of Holies or outside, are invalid; but the rites performed in the golden garments outside must not be done again. Said R. Johanan: Both have deduced it from the same verse. It is written [Lev. xvi. 34]: "And this shall be unto you as a statute for everlasting, to make an atonement for the children of Israel for all their sins once a year." R. Jehudah holds, what is meant by "once a year"? Where the atonements are made once a year, and that is in the Holy of Holies. R. Nehemiah holds, that not the place where once a year the rites are performed is meant, but the rites done for atoning once a year, and that is inside and outside.

How can R. Jehudah say, the place is meant? It is only written "once a year." We must say, the reason of R. Jehudah is this: It is written, "and *this* shall be," and then "*once* a year." Hence two limitations, one excluding what is performed in the white garments outside of the Holy of Holies, the other

excluding what is done in the golden garments. And R. Nehemiah says: The one expression excludes what is performed in the golden clothes, and the other the remainders of the blood, which, if not emptied at all, involves no transgression.

R. Hanina said: If he has taken the handfuls of frankincense before the bullock has been slaughtered, he has done nothing. This cannot be according to R. Jehudah, for according to R. Jehudah it is only the rites performed in the Holy of Holies, but this is done outside? Nay; even according to R. Jehudah it would have been invalid. Why? Because it is a preparatory service for a service performed in the Holy of Holies (it is equal to such a service).

Ulla said: If he has slaughtered the goat before the bullock's blood had been sprinkled, he has done nothing. An objection was raised: It is said in our Mishna, if he has sprinkled the he-goat's blood before the bullock's, he should sprinkle once more. If it were as Ulla says, it should have been said: he should slaughter a second time. Ulla explained the Mishna: That is the case with the offerings in the sanctuary, but in the Holy of Holies the bullock's blood must be sprinkled first, then the he-goat must be slaughtered. And so has also R. Ephes explained.

"The same is the case in the Temple," etc. The rabbis taught: It is written [Lev. xvi. 33]: "He shall make an atonement for the sanctuary of holiness, and for the tabernacle of the congregation and for the altar shall he make an atonement; and also for the priests and for all the people of the congregation shall he make an atonement." The sanctuary of holiness—that is, the Holy of Holies; by the tabernacle the Temple is meant—the altar, literally; "shall he make an atonement"—by this is meant the court where the priests might walk; "the priests," literally, "the people of the congregation," Israel; "make an atonement" once more—that means the Levites.

All are then equal in their atonement; that is, all are atoned for by the scapegoat for all sins except uncleanness. So said R. Jehudah. R. Simeon, however, said: As the blood of the he-goat, sprinkled inside, atones for Israel only the uncleannesses of the Temple and all sacred things, so the blood of the bullock atones for the priests only the sins of uncleanness. And as the confession over the scapegoat atoned for Israel's other sins, so also the confession over the bullock atoned for the other sins of the priests.

In a Boraitha we have learned: Rabbi has said: My Master, R. Jacob, has taught me this difference of opinion of R. Elazar and R. Simeon in our Mishna is only in relation to the *logs* offered by lepers.

R. Johanan said: The trespass-offering of a leper, if slaughtered for a wrong purpose, is where the same difference of opinion of our Mishna exists. According to R. Meir, who says that if he has made a mistake, he must begin anew, he must in this case also bring another trespass-offering. But according to R. Elazar and R. Simeon, who say that he must begin where he had made the mistake, there is no mending of this mistake; for it has been slaughtered already (and if he should slaughter another, he will offer *two*, while it is written *one*). The following Boraitha is according to R. Johanan: If a leper's trespass-offering has been slaughtered for another purpose, or some of its blood was not put on the thumbs and great toes of the leper, it may be offered on the altar, and requires a drink-offering; but another trespass-offering has to be offered.

The rabbis taught: All things mentioned in our Mishna—bullocks, he-goats—that have become invalid, defile the garments of him who burns them, and they must be burned in the place where the real sacrifices are burned. [See Lev. xvi. 27, 28.] So is the decree of R. Eliezer and R. Simeon. The sages, however, say: They are not to be burned, because only those which have been used the last, because used for the atonement, must be burned there. Rabha asked R. Na'hman: (If the he-goats have become invalid, two others are required) how many shall he despatch as scapegoats? R. Na'hman answered him: Shall he send a whole flock? R. Papi says in the name of Rabha: He sends the first. R. Simi says in the name of the same: The last. It is right according to R. Simi, because the other of the couple has been used for the atonement; but what is the reason of Rabha, according to R. Papi's saying? He holds as R. Jose of the following Boraitha: If one separates his Paschal lamb and the same be lost, and after he purchases another one in its stead the first one is found, he may offer either one of them. So is the decree of the sages. R. Jose, however, says: There is a merit to offer the first one, unless the second was a better one.

CHAPTER VI.

REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE HE-GOATS OF THE DAY OF ATONEMENT AND THE SENDING TO THE DESERT, AND THE CONFESSON THEREAT.

MISHNA: It is a merit that the two he-goats for the Day of Atonement should be equal in color, stature, and price, and both (bought) at the same time; but if they are not equal, they may still be used. If one was bought to-day, and the other on the morrow, they are valid. If one of them died, then if this occurs before the lots are drawn, another is purchased to make up the pair; but if later, then a new pair should be acquired. Lots should be drawn again, and this should be said: If the Lord's he-goat has died, "The one on which the lot has fallen for the Lord may substitute him"; and if that of Azazel has died, "The one on which the lot has fallen for Azazel may substitute him." And the remaining one of the previous pair should be allowed to feed (graze) till it chance to get a blemish, when it is sold, and the money goes as a gift-offering, since an animal designed to atone for the congregation is not put to death. R. Jehudah says, it is (put to death). Also said R. Jehudah: If the blood [of the Lord's he-goat, when slaughtered] had already been spilled, the scapegoat should be put to death; if the scapegoat had died, the other one's blood should be poured out [and a new pair purchased].

GEMARA: The rabbis taught: It is written [Lev. xvi. 5]: "He shall take two goats." Why is it mentioned, *two*? If it were in the plural, we would know, not less than two. It is meant, then, the two should be equals. How, then, do we know that when they were unlike they were still valid? Because it is written twice "goats" [ibid. 9, 10]. That shows, that if they were not alike they were still valid. But if "goat" were not repeated twice, they would have been, according to you, invalid? Whence would you deduce this? At the first glance, we would say, because it is written thrice "two" [ibid. 5, 7, 8]; but if the repetition of "goat" makes it valid, wherefore is this

repeated thrice? Infer from this, it is a merit that they be, first, equal in color; secondly, in stature; thirdly, in price. We have also learned thus in a Boraitha of sheep offered by lepers: It is written "two sheep." *Sheep* would suffice? From this it is also inferred they should be like each other, as stated above. But how do we know that if they are unlike each other they are valid? Because it is written "one sheep." The same Boraitha states in relation to the burnt-offering of a leper; there it is also written "two birds." The *two* could be dispensed with; and from the word *two* it is inferred that they should be alike. If it is so, why should we not say the same of the daily offerings, about which it is also written "*two sheep*"? This *two* is needed for what is stated in the following Boraitha: It is written [Num. xxviii. 3]: "Two on every day." From this we infer that it must be before the day's arrival (daybreak). (This is explained in Tract Tamid.)

The rabbis taught: Should the two he-goats of the Day of Atonement have been slaughtered outside of the Temple, if this was done before the drawing of the lots, he is culpable for both; but if later, he is culpable only for that designed for the Lord (not that for Azazel. Why should he be culpable?) Before the lots have been drawn, what are as yet these simple he-goats fit for? Said R. Hisda: Because they are fit for the additional sacrifices of the Day of Atonement, which are sacrificed outside of the Temple. (But how is this to be understood?) Why are they not fit to be sacrificed inside? Because the lots have not been drawn. The same is the case with the additional sacrifices; since all the services preceding these have not yet been performed they are not fit for additional sacrifices either?

R. Hisda holds: The inappropriate time is not to be compared with the unfitness of the goat itself (before the lots are drawn).

"*If the Lord's he-goat dies.*" Said Rabh: The second of the first pair must be sacrificed, but the second of the second pair must be left to graze. R. Johanan says conversely. On what point do they differ? Rabh says: A living thing is not postponed. (The second goat of the first pair, being fit, should not be postponed in favor of another goat to be sought out), and R. Johanan says, that such are postponed. What is Rabh's reason? Because he deduces it from the too early time; as he was unfit only as long as he had no fellow, he is fit henceforth. What comparison is this? In that case the he-goat was not yet

fit for anything, but here he has been already postponed. Why not continue to be postponed? Therefore we must say: Rabh deduces it from a temporary blemish. After the blemish has passed away, he is fit; so here, his unfitness is considered temporary.

According to Rabh's theory (that a living thing is not postponed), why only the second of the first pair and not as well of the second pair, say, then, he can choose which he likes? Said Rabha: Rabh holds as R. Jose that it is a merit to use the first (as mentioned at the end of the preceding chapter). Rabha said: It seems to us, that our Mishna is in accordance with Rabh, and a Boraitha is in accordance with R. Johanan. In our Mishna, it is stated: If the Lord's he-goat dies, the one on which the lot has fallen for the Lord shall substitute him; from this we infer that the other one continues to be as it has been. A Boraitha is according to R. Johanan, as we have learned: It is said in the Mishna*: The second should be allowed to graze. We do not know whether the second of the first or second pair. As it is written [Lev. xvi. 10]: "Shall be placed alive." Placed *alive*, not the one whose fellow is dead. How can that be inferred? "*Shall be placed alive*," signifies that it shall be placed alive *now*. But the one whose fellow had died has been left alive already. An objection was raised from the following sentence in our Mishna: "R. Jehudah said also: If the blood of the Lord's he-goat had been spilled, the scapegoat should be put to death; if the scapegoat had died, the other one's blood should be poured out." It is right according to Rabh, who says that, according to the first Tana, living things are not postponed, and the second of the second pair is to be left to graze; and what R. Jehudah says of its being put to death refers to the second of the first pair. It is right according to Rabh, who says that according to the first Tana a living thing is not postponed, as it is said in the Mishna, "also said R. Jehudah." That is to say, he differs on two points: first, whether a sin-offering for the congregation is put to death (he says, it shall be put to death), and whether a living thing is postponed. R. Jehudah says, it is postponed, and shall be put to death, and the second of the first pair shall be put to death. But according to R. Johanan, who explains that the first Tana means to say the second of the second pair

* This is according to Rashi's explanation, although it is unusual for a Boraitha to mention a Mishna.

(shall be sacrificed), but of the first shall be put to death, because a living thing can be postponed, consequently R. Jehudah differs from the first Tana only on one point, on the congregational offering. Why does the Mishna say, "and also"? This difficulty remains. (From this we see, the Mishna is according to Rabh, not R. Johanan.)

"If the blood has been spilled, the scapegoat should be put to death." It is right that if the blood has been spilled, the scapegoat should be put to death, because the duty with the blood has not been fulfilled yet; but if the scapegoat has died, why should the blood be poured out? The duty (of drawing the lots, and of slaughtering the first) has been fulfilled already. Why need the blood be poured out? Said the disciples of R. Janai: Because it is written [ibid.]: "Shall be placed alive before the Lord, to make an atonement for him." That means he (the scapegoat) shall be alive till the atonement with the blood (of the other goat) has been made (and when he has died before, the blood must be poured out).

We have learned in a Boraitha about the Mishna in Shekalim, II., a. "If the inhabitants of a town sent their Shekalim," etc., as far as, "and nothing is credited to next year's account" (pp. 7, 8). R. Jehudah, however, said, they may be credited to next year's account. What is the reason of R. Jehudah? Said Rabba: R. Jehudah holds, the duties to be paid this year may be paid the next year. Abayi objected: From the following Tosephtha: The bullock and the he-goat of the Day of Atonement, if lost, and the he-goats offered for idolatry, if lost, and substituted by others and then recovered, then all should be put to death. So says R. Jehudah. If the duties of this year can be paid the next year, they could be left for the next year? Rabh answered: You want to compare the he-goats for idolatry to congregational sacrifices. The latter are quite different. This is as R. Tebi said in the name of R. Joshiah: It is written [Num. xxviii. 14]: "This is the burnt-offering of the new moon for every month throughout the months of the year." The Torah says: Proclaim it a new month, and also bring a sacrifice from *the new products* (Rosh Hashana, p. 9). This would be right in case of the he-goat, for it comes from the congregational funds; but the bullock, which is from the high-priest's, what can be said to it? And, secondly, what R. Tebi said in the name of R. Joshiah is only a merit, but not a duty, as R. Jehudah said in the name of Samuel [ibid., ibid.], that if it was done it is acceptable?

Therefore says R. Zerah: The reason is, that the lot cannot determine during this year for the next year. Let him draw lots the next year? It is a precautionary measure, lest it be said that the lot does determine during one year for the next year. All this is right of the he-goat? But why should the bullock, for which no lots are drawn, be put to death? It is a precautionary measure, lest one should deal with the he-goat as one would with the bullock.

Shall he then be put to death for a precautionary measure against what itself is a precautionary measure? Therefore, says Rabha: It is a precautionary measure, lest there should be a mistake. What mistake can be made? That of sacrificing them (if left to graze). Then this apprehension ought to exist in all cases where animals are left to graze (till they get a blemish and are sold)? If that of shearing their wool, or using them for work, the same fear ought to exist in all cases where invalid sacrifices are left to graze? The mistake of sacrificing them is meant, but for others there is no intention to sacrifice them at any time, as they are left to graze until they get a blemish; therefore a mistake cannot come to pass. But here, as the he-goat must be kept until the Day of Atonement of the next year, and it may be sacrificed by mistake before (the owner will take care it should *not* get a blemish). And whether a precautionary measure is taken against a mistake or not, the Tanaim of the two following Boraithas differ: one states, that a paschal sacrifice that has not been sacrificed during Passover may be sacrificed during the second Passover (the succeeding month, when those unclean before, celebrate it); and when not during the second Passover, it may be reserved for the Passover of the next year. And in another Boraitha we have learned: It may not be sacrificed at all. They differ, then, about the apprehension of a mistake; the Tana of the last Boraitha fears a mistake, and that of the first does not.

MISHNA: He comes to the scapegoat, and puts both hands on him, and confesses, using the following expression: I beseech Thee, Jehovah, they have committed iniquities, transgressed, sinned before Thee, Thy people the House of Israel. I beseech Thee, for the sake of Jehovah, forgive the iniquities, transgressions, and sins that they have committed, transgressed, and sinned before Thee, Thy people the House of Israel, as it is written in the Torah of Moses Thy servant, thus: "For on that day shall he make an atonement for you, to cleanse you,

that ye may be clean from all your sins before Jehovah." And the priests and people who stood in the forecourt, hearing the expressed name [of God, *i.e.*, Jehovah] issuing from the mouth of the high-priest, used to kneel, prostrate themselves, and fall on their faces, and say: "Blessed be the name of His kingdom's glory for ever." They delivered him [the scapegoat] to the man who was his conductor. All were fit to perform this function. Only the high-priests fixed a usage, that Israelites should not be permitted to do it. Said R. Jose: It happened the conductor was Arsala of Tsipore, who was an Israelite [not a priest]. An elevated walk had been constructed for him [the he-goat], on account of the Babylonians [Babylonian Jews; according to the Gemara, Alexandrian Jews], who used to pull him [the he-goat] by the hair, saying: "Take [the sins] and go, take and go."

GEMARA: We see that in this confession the children of Aaron are not mentioned. According to whom is it? Said R. Jeremiah: This is not in accordance with R. Jehudah; as he said, the priests are also atoned for by the scapegoat. Abayi, however, said: This may be according to R. Jehudah. Are not the priests included in the general phrase, "Thy people Israel"?

"*They delivered him to his conductor.*" The rabbis taught: It is written [Lev. xvi. 21]: "A man appointed thereto." From the word "man," it is inferred a layman is also fit. "Appointed" means, appointed from the day before, even when the Day of Atonement falls on a Sabbath, and even if he is unclean. Wherefore does he tell us, even a Sabbath? If the he-goat has become sick, and cannot walk, he may take him on his shoulder, and carry him. Said Raphram: From this it is inferred, that the law of Erub and carrying applies to Sabbath only, but not to the Day of Atonement (else what difference between a Day of Atonement falling on a week-day and a Sabbath?)*

Why is it mentioned, even when unclean? What case of uncleanness can be here? Said R. Shesheth: Even if the conductor became unclean, he may enter the Temple and take the he-goat.

R. Eliezer was asked: When the he-goat had become sick, might he be taken on the shoulders? He replied: The he-goat was so healthy that it could bear away you and me together. They asked him again: When the conductor had become sick, may another be appointed? He replied: Let us be healthy; do not

* What Raphram said is declared in Tract Tamid to be unfounded.

ask us about a case of sickness. They asked him again: If after having been pushed down he did not die, shall he go down and kill him? He gave them as answer the verse in Judges v. 31: "Thus may perish all Thy enemies, O Lord." The sages, however, said: If he had become sick, he must be taken on the shoulders; if the conductor is sick, another should be appointed; if he had been pushed and has not died, he should go down and put him to death.

R. Eliezer was asked whether a certain man would enjoy the world to come. He replied: You inquire of me concerning *that* man (he named a different man).* They asked of him again: May a shepherd rescue a sheep carried away by a lion? He replied: Do you ask me of a sheep? They asked him again: May the shepherd be rescued from the lion's mouth? He answered again: You ask me only of the shepherd. They asked him again: May a bastard be heir of his father? He asked them: May he espouse his dead and childless brother's wife? They asked him: If he possesses a house, must a memorial of the Temple's destruction be left, when his house is whitewashed (an ell is left bare)? He answered: I think you ask me whether his sepulchre is to be whitewashed? He answered thus, not because he wanted to repel them, but he never decided what he had not heard from his Master.

A wise woman asked R. Eliezer: What was done with the golden calf being equally forbidden, why were the penalties different, some being slaughtered with the sword, some dying by water, or by a plague? He answered: The wisdom of a woman relates only to the spindle, as it is written [Ex. xxxv. 25]: "All the wise women spun with their hands." It was taught: Rabh and Levi said—the one, that he who slaughtered to the golden calf and offered incense was slain by the sword; he who embraced and kissed it, died by the plague; and he who rejoiced in his heart thereat, died from dropsy. And the other says: They who did it in spite of warning by witnesses, were slain; they who were not warned but only witnessed, by the pest; and those whom witnesses had not seen, died by dropsy.

R. Jehudah said: The tribe of Levi was not idolatrous (in relation to the golden calf), as it is written [ibid. xxxii. 26]: "Whoever is on the Lord's side let him come unto me. And

* Rashi and Tosphath say, the question was about Solomon, and he answered, "Do they mean Absalom?" But it does not seem probable to them.

there assembled themselves unto him all the sons of Levi." Rabhina was sitting and repeating this saying. The children of R. Papa b. Abba objected to him: It is written [Deut. xxxiii. 9]: "Who said of his father and his mother, I have not seen him."* By this is meant, those who slew for worshipping the calf, inflicted penalty on their relatives. Whence we see some of the Levites were guilty. Rabhina replied: By *father* is meant the maternal grandfather, who was of Israel, by brother a half-brother of the mother, and by children, the daughter's children, whose father was an Israelite.

"*An elevated walk had been constructed,*" etc. We have learned in a Boraitha: R. Jehudah says: They were not Babylonian, but Alexandrian (Jews). Said R. Jose to him: May thy mind be appeased, as thou hast appeased mine (for he was a Babylonian himself).

"*Take and go.*" We have learned in a Boraitha: They used to say: Wherefore are they detaining the goat, the sins being so great?

MISHNA: Some of the prominent men of Jerusalem used to accompany him [the goat] as far as the first booth [of the ten, supplied with provisions for the conductor]. There were ten booths between Jerusalem and Tsuk [the rock of its destination], a distance of 90 Ris [$7\frac{1}{2}$ Ris are equal to one mile]. At each booth they said to him [to the conductor]: "Here is food, and here is water." And they [persons of the booth] accompanied him from booth to booth, excepting the last of them, for the rock was not reached by them; but they stood at some distance looking on what he [the conductor] did [to the scapegoat]. What did he do? He divided the tongue of crimson wool: the half of it he tied to the rock, and the second half between his [the scapegoat's] horns; he pushed him down backward. He went rolling and falling down; he did not reach halfway of the mountain before he became separated limb from limb. He [the conductor] returned to sit down under the last booth, till dark. And since when became his clothes unclean? After he had issued from the walls of Jerusalem. R. Simeon says: After he had pushed it down from the rock.

GEMARA: The rabbis taught: There were ten booths, and twelve miles: so says R. Meir. R. Jebudah says: There were nine booths, and ten miles. R. Jose says: Five booths, and

* We follow Leeser's translation in all our biblical quotations, which see.

ten miles. All were combined by an Erub. Said R. Jose: Elazar my son told me, if there were an Erub, two booths at ten miles would have been sufficient. Who is the Tana according to whom is what we have learned in our Mishna, that the last stood at a distance and looked? This is according to R. Meir, who says there were ten booths, and twelve miles.

"*At each booth they said to him,*" etc. We have learned in a Boraitha: They never made use of it, but they were cheered by the consciousness that they could have it?

"*The half of it he tied to the rock,*" etc. Why not the whole of it? Because he had not yet fulfilled the duty of pushing down the goat, and as soon as he had tied it to the rock, it might have become white: he would have rejoiced so much at the thought of the sins having been pardoned, that he might not have attended to the pushing him down. Why did he not tie it wholly to the horns? Because it might happen that the goat bent his head, so as to make him unable to perceive whether it had become white or not.

The rabbis taught: Formerly the tongue of crimson wool used to be tied to the door of the porch, outside (that all should see). When it became white, all were rejoiced; when not, all became out of spirits and ashamed. Therefore it has been reformed that it should be tied to the door of the porch inside. However, they used to take a look at it even then. It was then reformed that half should be tied to the rock, another half to the horns.

"*Before he attained half way of the mountain,*" etc. The rabbis taught: It is written [Lev. xviii. 4]: "My ordinances shall ye do." This signifies, such things as, even were they not written, it would be wrong to do, as idolatry, adultery, blood-shed, robbery, and blasphemy. "And my statutes shall ye keep" [ibid.]. There are things that Satan laughs at, as abstaining from pork, from wearing mixed stuffs [Deut. xxii. 11], the taking off of the shoe of the husband's brother, purification of a leper, and the despatching of the he-goat. Lest it be said, they are nonsense, it is therefore written [Lev. xviii. 4]: "I am the Lord your God." I have commanded it; you have no right to question.

"*Since when became his clothes unclean,*" etc. The rabbis taught: The conductor defiles his clothes, but not the person that sends him (the conductor). Shall we assume that as soon as

he comes out from the walls of the Temple court he becomes unclean? Therefore it is written [Lev. xvi. 26]: "He that takes away the goat to Azazel shall wash his clothes." What is meant by taking away? He who pushes him head downward, and he defiles his clothes.

MISHNA: He [the high-priest] went to the bull and to the he-goat destined to be burned. He ripped them, and tore out the parts to be burned upon the altar. He placed them on a charger (Magis), and kindled (for kindling) them upon the altar. He intermingled the limbs of the two animals, and they were removed to the place for burning. Since when are the clothes [of the porters] made unclean? When they came out behind the wall of the forecourt. R. Simeon says: When the fire is consuming most parts [of the animals].

GEMARA: *He intermingled.* Said R. Johanan, a sort of mingling. What is meant? We have learned in a Boraitha: He did not cut them as all burnt-offerings, in which the hide is flayed; but the bullock and he-goat, he cut the hide and flesh together. Whence do we deduce this? Because it is further written [Lev. iv. 11]: "His inwards, and his dung." How is it to be inferred from this? Said R. Papa: As the dung was in the inwards, so the flesh in the hide.

"*Since when are the clothes made unclean?*" The rabbis taught: It is written [ibid. xvi. 28]: "He that burneth them shall wash his clothes." He that burns, but not he who kindles, or he who lays the wood for the fire. Who is considered as the one that burns? He who assists at the burning, his clothes become unclean. Shall we say, that when it has been burned to ashes they still defile the clothes? Therefore it is written "them": he who burns *them*, but not the ashes. R. Eliezer b. R. Simeon says: When the flesh is still called flesh, it defiles; but when it has been dissolved, it no longer defiles. What is the difference between them? According to R. Eliezer, singed flesh ceases to be flesh, and does not defile; but according to the first Tana it is, and does.

MISHNA: The high-priest was told: "The goat has reached the desert." How was the fact known? Watches were stationed on high towers [meaning doubtful], who lifted up flags [to give signals]. Said R. Jehudah: They could have excellent evidence [by calculating the time]. From Jerusalem to Beth Hadudo was three miles. The prominent men had walked one mile, went back one mile, and had tarried as long as a mile is

TRACT YOMAH (DAY OF ATONEMENT). 97

gone over. Thus they could calculate that the he-goat had reached the desert.

R. Ishmael says: Why, they had another sign. A tongue of crimson wool used to be tied to the gate of the Temple, and as the he-goat had reached the desert, the wool used to become [by miracle] white; as it is said: "Though your sins be scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red as crimson, they shall become like wool" [Isaiah i. 18].

GEMARA: Said Abayi: From this we see that the Beth Hadudo was in the desert.

CHAPTER VII.

REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE PASSAGES READ BY THE HIGH-PRIEST AND WHAT GARMENTS HE MINISTERED IN AFTER, AND WHAT GARMENTS OTHER PRIESTS WORE.

MISHNA : The high-priest came to read. If he desired to read dressed in linen [white, byssus] garments, he did so ; otherwise, he was reading in a white stole of his own. The Hazzan [servant, attendant] of the congregation takes the scrolls of the Torah, and presents them to the president of the congregation, the president presents them to the Segan, and the latter gives them to the high-priest. The high-priest rises, receives them, and reads standing. He reads the section, "After the death," etc. [*i. e.*, Lev. xvi.], and the section, "Also on the tenth," etc. [*i. e.*, Lev. xxiii. 26-32]. Then he rolls the scrolls together, and keeps them on his knees, and says: "More than what I have read to you, is written here." The section, "On the tenth," etc. [in the book of Numbers, xxix. 17], he reads by heart, and pronounces over it eight benedictions; namely, over the Torah, over the service, over the thanksgiving, the atonement of iniquity, the Temple by itself, and Israel by itself (and Jerusalem by itself, *in some versions*), the priests by themselves, and the rest of the prayer. He who sees the high-priest reading, does not witness the burning of the bull and the he-goat ; he who witnesses the burning of the bull and the he-goat, does not see the high-priest reading : not because he is not allowed, but because there was a great distance, and both were done at the same time.

GEMARA : (Let us see :) If he might read in a white stole of his own, then we must assume that this is not a service for which the sacred garments are required ; but at the same time, we see that he could read in the white garments. Hence we see they could be used even at other times than that of service. Infer from this, that the priestly garments he could use for his own benefit. Perhaps reading is different : though not itself a service, it is a preparation for service. Then the schoolmen pro-

pounded a question: May the priestly garments be used for personal purposes or not? Come and hear: The priest's garments, in the country, may not be used; but in the Temple, whether during service or not, they may be used, because it is allowed to derive a benefit from the priestly garments. Infer from this, that he may. You say, in the country it may not be used? Have we not learned in the following Boraitha: On the twenty-fifth of Tebeth is called the day of Mount Gerizzim, and no mourning is allowed on it. Why? Because on that day the Samaritans petitioned Alexander of Macedon to have our Temple destroyed, and he permitted them. When Simeon the Upright (the high-priest) was notified of it, he put on the priestly garments, and accompanied by the respectable men of Jerusalem, they all went with torches the whole night till dawn, both parties approaching each other. When it dawned, Alexander of Macedon perceived from a distance the Jews. He asked, Who are these men? And the Samaritans told him: They are the Jews, who have rebelled against thee. As they reached the town Antipatris, the sun had risen, and they faced each other. As Alexander saw R. Simeon the Upright, he descended from his chariot, and bowed to him. They said to him: Will such a great king as you bow to that Jew? He replied: His image I saw shining before me, whenever I gained a victory. He asked the Jews: Wherefore are you come? They said: The Temple wherein we pray for thee, and for thy empire, that it should not be destroyed, is it possible that thou shouldst be misled by the idolaters to bid its destruction? He asked: Who are those idolaters? They replied: These Samaritans who stand near thee. He said to them: I deliver them into your hands. Treat them as you please. They were soon fastened to the tails of their horses, and thus dragged as far as Mount Gerizzim, which was ploughed, and sowed, as they had intended to do with our Temple. This day was made a festival. (We see that Simeon the Upright went out even into the country in his priestly clothes.) If you wish, I will say, not the priestly clothes were meant, but clothes similar; and if you wish, I will say, this was in a case of urgency, and it is written [Ps. cxix. 126]: "It is time to act for the Lord: they have broken Thy law."

"*The Hazzan takes the scrolls,*" etc. Infer from this that honor is given to the disciple even in presence of the Master. Said Abayi: All this was only to honor the high-priest (that he might get it through many subordinate great officers).

"The high-priest rises." It seems then implied that hitherto he was sitting. Have we not learned in a Mishna (in Sotah) that nobody might sit in the Temple, except kings who are descendants of David? Said R. Hisda: He was then in the women's court, and there all could sit. It is written: [Nehem. viii. 6]: "And Ezra blessed the Lord, the great God." Why is the epithet "great" employed here? Said R. Joseph in the name of Rabh: He then magnified him by calling him expressly "Jehovah." R. Gidel said: By saying as it is written [1 Chron. xvi. 36]: "Blessed be the Lord the God of Israel from everlasting even unto everlasting." Said Abayi to R. Dimi: Why not as R. Jose said in Rabh's name? R. Dimi answered: Because "Jehovah" must not be pronounced outside of the Temple.

Is that so? Is it not written [Nehem. viii. 4]: "Ezra the expounder stood upon an elevated stand of wood," and R. Gidel has said, he then pronounced the name "Jehovah"? This was only because on that occasion Ezra allowed himself to use it, as he deemed it necessary. It is written [ibid. ix. 4]: "They cried with a loud voice unto the Lord." What did they say? They cried: "Woe! Woe! The tempter to idolatry has destroyed the Temple, has killed all the just men, and exiled Israel from their land, and we see him yet among us. Why hast thou created the tempter? To reward us more for overcoming him. We wish neither him nor the greater rewards." Then fell down a billet from Heaven, whereon was written: "Emeth" (Truth). [Says R. Hanina: Infer from this that the seal of the Holy One, blessed be He, is "Truth."] They fasted three days and three nights. Then he (the evil spirit) was delivered into their hands. So they saw how a lion-cub of fire went out from the Holy of Holies. Then the prophet said to them: "Here is the evil spirit of idolatry." As it is written [Zechariah v. 8]: "This is the wickedness." They caught him. When a hair was torn out from his mane, he issued a cry which was heard at the distance of four hundred *parsas*. They said: If he cries so loud, what can we do to him? Lest he be pitied in Heaven, what shall we do that his voice be not heard? They were then advised to throw him into a leaden pot, as lead muffles the voice. They put him into a leaden pot, and covered it with a leaden lid, as it is written [ibid.]: "And he said, this is the wickedness. And he cast it into the midst of the ephah, and he cast the weighty lead cover upon the mouth thereof." (And since then idolatry ceased

among Israel.) They said: Since it is a time of favor (from Heaven), they would pray that the tempter to fornication be delivered to them too. They prayed, and he was delivered to them. It was said to them : "Take heed. If ye kill this spirit, the world will perish." They kept him imprisoned three days. They sought in all Palestine an egg laid on that day. They could not find. They said among themselves: What shall we do? If we will kill him, the world will perish. Shall we pray for the half (that desire should exist only in legal cases)? We have a tradition that a half is not given from Heaven; so they put out his eyes, and left him. The good result was, that since then he does not excite desire toward relatives.

In Palestine they learned it thus: R. Gidel says: "Great," because he pronounced the express name of God. R. Mathna says: What is written "the great," means that he said [Nehem. ix. 32]: "Our God the great, the mighty, and the terrible." But what R. Mathna had said, will be according to R. Joshua b. Levi, who said: Why was it called the Great Assembly? Because they restored the old crown. What is it? Moses had said [Deut. x. 17]: "The God, the great, the mighty, and the terrible." Then rose Jeremiah and said: The idolaters are destroying His Temple. Where is His terribleness? So he said only "the great, the mighty," omitting "terrible." Then came Daniel, and said: The idolaters keep as slaves His children. Where is His might? So he omitted "mighty." Then came the men of the Great Assembly, and said: On the contrary, this is His might, that He is patient toward the wicked. And this is His terribleness, that if men had not felt His terror, how could such a small people (as Israel) keep itself among so many peoples of idolaters? Therefore they introduced again the phrase, "the God, the great, the terrible, the mighty." And the rabbis (Jeremiah and Daniel), how did they dare to modify what Moses had established? Says R. Elazar: Because they knew the Holy One, blessed be He, loves truth. So they did not wish to lie to Him, to tell Him what they did not think.

"More than what I have read to you," etc. To what purpose did he say so? That the scrolls he used should not be said maliciously to contain only that which he read (and be invalid).

"He reads by heart." Why? Let him have found the place in the scrolls? In honor of a congregation, it is not made to wait till the scrolls should have been unrolled for that purpose. Let him have used other scrolls? This they did not, because if they

brought other scrolls, it might be said, the first scrolls were invalid. So says R. Huna b. Jehudah. But Resh Lakish says: In that case, a second benediction would have had to be pronounced (over the new scrolls). Do we fear lest it be said that the scrolls are invalid? Did not R. Itz'hak of Naph'ha say: That when the first day of the month Tebeth falls on Sabbath, three scrolls have to be taken out: one for the section of that week, one for Hannkah, the third for the first day of the month? When three persons read in these scrolls, it is not feared; but when one man reads in two, it may be said he does not read in the first because the first is invalid.

"Pronounces over it eight benedictions." The rabbis taught: Over the scrolls as in the synagogue, over the service, over the thanksgiving, the atonement of iniquity as it has been ordered in the prayer of the Day of Atonement, over the Temple by itself, over the priests by themselves, over Israel by itself, and over the rest of the prayer. The rabbis taught: What is meant by the rest of the prayer? Songs, prayers: "We supplicate before (to) Thee for Thy people Israel, who need help," and concluding, "Blessed be he who heareth prayer." After this, every one brought a scroll of the Torah from home and read it for himself. Why did they bring them? To show to the whole world that they had scrolls (and loved religion).

"He who sees the high-priest reading," etc. Is this not self-evident? We might think, lest one assume one may not pass from place to place in search of religious duties, he comes to teach us that it is not so. And what merit is there? Because it is written [Prov. xiv. 28]: "In the multitude of people is the king's glory."

MISHNA: If he read in linen garments, he washed his hands and feet, stripped himself, and went down to bathe, came out and dried himself with a sponge. Garments of cloth of gold were brought to him, he put them on, washed his hands and his feet, he went out and performed the rites on his ram, and the ram of the people, and the seven unblemished sheep, of one year—according to R. Eliezer. R. Aqiba says: They were offered with the daily sacrifice of the morning; and the bull for the burnt-offering and the he-goat used outside, were offered with the daily sacrifice of the evening. He washed his hands and feet, undressed, went down to bathe, came up and dried himself. White clothes were brought to him, he put them on, washed his hands and feet, he went in to fetch the spoon and the censer.

He washed his hands and his feet again, stripped himself, went down, bathed, came out and dried himself. Garments of cloth of gold were brought to him, he put them on, washed his hands and feet, and went in to offer the incense of the evening, and to trim the lamps. He then washed his hands and feet, stripped himself, put on his own clothes—which had been brought to him—and was accompanied to his own house. He then used to keep the day as a holiday with his friends, when he had come away from the Holy of Holies unhurt.

GEMARA : The disciples of Samuel taught : R. Eliezer said : He went out, and performed the rites on his ram, and the ram of the people, and the members of the sin-offering. But the bullock of the burnt-offering, and the seven sheep, and the he-goat that was used outside, were offered together with the daily evening offering. In a Tosephtha it was taught : R. Aqiba said : The bullock of the burnt-offering and the seven sheep were offered with the daily morning offering, as it is written [Num. xxviii. 23] : "Besides the burnt-offering of the morning, which is for a continual burnt-offering." And then he made the offerings of this day, and then the he-goat used outside, as it is written [Num. xxviii. 11] : "One he-goat for a sin-offering, besides the sin-offering of the atonement"; and then he offered his ram, and the people's ram, the members of the sin-offering, and then the daily evening offering.

We see that all agree, that there was but one ram for the people ; and this would be according to Rabbi of the following Boraitha : Rabbi said, the one ram mentioned here [Lev. xvi. 5] is the same as is mentioned in Num. xxix. 8. And R. Elazar b. R. Simeon says : Two were needed : one mentioned in Leviticus, the other in Numbers. What is the reason of Rabbi's saying ? Because it is written "one." What will R. Elazar b. R. Simeon say to this ? That signifies, the only one (best) in his flock. Rabbi, however, says : There is no need to state it, as it has already been mentioned [Deut. xii. 11] : "Your choice vows." According to R. Elazar b. R. Simeon, both statements are needed, because there it is only spoken of voluntary offerings.

"He washed his hands and feet." The rabbis taught : It is written [xvi. 23] : "And Aaron shall then go into the tabernacle of the congregation." Wherefore ? To take out the spoon and the censer. Why ? Because the whole section follows the order of his rites, except this verse. What is the reason of say-

ing that this verse applies to the taking out of the spoon and censer? Said R. Hisda: It is known to us traditionally, that five batheings and ten times of washing the high-priest performed that day. If thou wilt say, that this verse is not in a wrong place—namely, that no service done outside in the garments of cloth of gold would intervene between the day service (done in white) and the carrying out of the spoon and censer—then you would not find five and ten, but three and six. R. Zera opposed: Perhaps it was intervened by the he-goat used outside. Said Abayi: Because it is written [ibid. 24]: "And come then forth and offer his burnt-offering," we infer that after the first coming forth he offered the burnt-offering (that goat). Then we must say that the spoon and censer he had not yet carried out, else it would be his second coming forth.

When the conductor of the scapegoat returned, if he met the high-priest still in the street, he said to him: "My lord the high-priest, we have done thy commission"; but if he came to his house (on the morrow), he used to say to him: "We have done the commission of Him who giveth life to all living." Rabba said: In Pumbaditha, when the rabbis took leave, they said: "He who giveth life to all the living should give thee long good, and orderly life."

It is written [Ps. cxvi. 9]: "I will walk before the Lord in the lands of the living." (What is meant by the lands of the living?) Said R. Jehudah: The market-places (where food is purchased). Rashi explains this, as to a "long life." This is mentioned, and as for the markets, David persecuted by Saul prayed to be able to go to the markets to buy food.

It is written [Prov. iii. 2]: "For length of days, and years of life, and peace, will they increase unto thee." What means "years of life"? Are there any years not of life? Said R. Elazar: Those are the years of man when his circumstances change from evil to good. Said R. Brachia: It is written further [ibid. viii. 4]: "Unto you, O men,* I call." By this scholars are meant, who are weak like women, and perform feats as men. R. Brachia said again: He who wishes to bring a drink-offering on the altar should let scholars drink wine (which will be just as good). The same says again: When a man sees that learning has forsaken his sons, he should marry a scholar's daughter. As it is written [Job xiv. 8, 9]: "If even its root become old in the earth, and

* Men is in Hebrew here נְמִשִּׁים (not נְנִשִּׁים), as if the plural of נָשָׁה—woman.

its stock die in the dust : yet through the scent of water will it flourish again, and produce boughs as though it were newly planted."

"*He then used to keep the day as a holiday.*" The rabbis taught : It happened to one high-priest going out from the Temple, and the whole world accompanying him, that they perceived Shemaia and Abtalian : the people then left the high-priest alone, and accompanied Shemaia and Abtalian. Later, Shemaia and Abtalian came to take leave of him. He answered them : May the children of the Gentiles (they were proselytes' descendants) go in peace. They replied to him : The children of the Gentiles may go in peace, because they do what Aaron the high-priest did ; but the children of Aaron may not have peace, who do not what Aaron did (love not peace).

MISHNA : The high-priest ministers in eight articles of dress ; a common priest in four : in a robe and breeches, a mitre and a girdle. To the high-priest's are added : a breastplate and an ephod, and a coat and a *tsits* [plate on the forehead, Ex. xxviii. 36]. The Urim and Tumim were inquired of only when he was thus attired ; but inquiries were not made for a common man : only for the king, the chief of the Beth Din, and for a person of whom the public had need.

GEMARA : The rabbis taught : The stuff, which should be made according to the prescription of the Bible, of linen, should be six times *twisted*. Where twisted linen is prescribed, it should be eightfold twisted. The material of the robe of the high-priest was twelve times twisted ; that of the vail, twenty-four ; and that of the breastplate and ephod, twenty-eight. How do we know that an ordinary thread is six times twisted ? Because it is written [Ex. xxxix. 27, 28] : "And they made the coats of linen . . . the mitre of linen, and the goodly bonnets of linen, and linen breeches of twisted linen thread." Five times "linen" is mentioned : once, to know that it is linen ; the second time, that it be twisted six times ; once, that it should be twisted ; and once, that even the articles of dress of which it is not said "linen" should be of linen ; the fifth time, to prohibit (those not of linen).*

How do we know that "Shesh" means "linen" ? Because it is written "bad" (in some places, as equivalent to "Shesh") which signifies "only," and flax grows single from the reed in

* *Shesh* (linen) means also *six*.

the middle, not in branches. Perhaps wool found between the tree and bark is meant? That can be separated into threads, but flax can not. But flax can also be separated? Flax can be separated when it is beaten, but that material can be so spontaneously. Rabhina says: Because it is written [Ezek. xliv. 18]: "flaxen bonnets," and "flaxen breeches." Said R. Ashi to him: If thou adduce the proof from Ezekiel, how did they know it before Ezekiel? They had a tradition. Ezekiel wrote a verse. How do we know that "twisted linen" is eight times twisted? Because it is written [Ex. xxxix. 24]: "They made upon the lower hem of the robe pomegranates of blue, and purple, and scarlet yarn, twisted." Hence we deduce from an analogy of expression in another place (of the vail), by "twisted" twenty-four times is meant, so here, the thread of each kind being eight times twisted. How do we know that that of the robe should be of threads twelve times twisted? Because it is written [ibid. xxviii. 31]: "And thou shalt make the robe of the ephod altogether of blue woollen yarn." Here it is also inferred from an analogy of expression, as "blue" is mentioned speaking of the value also, as there every thread was six times twisted (since four kinds were twenty-four), so here, since it is written "altogether," it should be two times six. How do we know that the vail was of a material of threads twenty-four times twisted? Because it was of four kinds, and that each should not be less than six times twisted, it is unnecessary to deliberate upon. How do we know that that of the breastplate and ephod was of threads twenty-eight times twisted? Because it is written [Ex. xxviii. 15]: "And thou shalt make the breastplate of judgment of weavers' work; after the work of the ephod thou shalt make it: of gold, of blue, of purple, and scarlet yarn, and twisted linen, shalt thou make it." Four kinds, each sixfold, is twenty-four; and the gold four times, this makes twenty-eight. How is it known that the gold is four times? Perhaps also six times? Said R. Ashi: Because it is written [ibid. xxxix. 3]: "To work it in the blue and in the purple." Therefore it must be at least thinner than those threads.

Re'haba said in the name of R. Jehudah; He who tears the priestly garments, receives stripes, as it is written [ibid. xxviii. 32]: "That it be not rent."

R. Eliezer said: He who takes off the breastplate from the ephod, or the staves from the ark, receives stripes, as it is written [ibid. xxviii. 28]: "That it be not loosed," and [ibid. xxv.

15] : "They shall not be removed therefrom." We have learned also in a Boraitha: It is written [ibid.] : "In the rings of the ark shall the staves be." We might think they must be always there, and may not be moved. Therefore it is written [ibid. 14]: "Thou shalt place the staves into the rings." From the expression, "place the staves into the rings," we might think that as they are placed there, they may be removed thence also. Therefore it is written, "In the rings of the ark shall the staves be." How is it then? They may be drawn out, but not wholly taken out (as their heads were too thick). R. Huma b. R. Hanina said: It is written [ibid. xxvi. 15]: "The boards for the tabernacle of Shittim wood, standing up." What means standing up? They shall be standing up as they grow. Re'haba said in the name of R. Jehudah: Bezaleel made three arks: the middle one was wooden, nine spans high; the one inside was of gold, and eight spans high; that outside was also of gold, and ten spans and odd high—nine, like the middle one, and a span and a trifle over, to screen it. We have learned in another Boraitha that it was eleven and a trifle? It presents no difficulty. This is according to one who says, the gold on the top was a span thick; and he who says it was ten, says it was not a span thick. Why was the fraction needed? That it should seem like a small crown on the top of the ark under the mercy-seat.

R. Johanan said: There were three crowns: one of the altar, one of the ark, and one of the table. Of the altar, called "the Crown of Priesthood," Aaron was privileged to receive; of the table, that of royalty, David received; that of the ark, called "the Crown of Learning," is yet to be bestowed. Shouldst thou say it is not valuable? therefore it is written [Prov. viii. 15]; "Through me do kings reign."

It is written [Ex. xxv. 11]: "Within and without shalt thou overlay it" (the ark). Says Rabba: It can be inferred from this, That a scholar whose inside is not like his outside is no scholar. Abayi, according to others Rabba b. Ulla, says: Not only is he no scholar, he is even called "corrupt," as it is written [Job xv. 16]: "How much more abominable and corrupt the man who drinketh like water wrong-doing." R. Samuel b. Na'hmain in the name of R. Jonathan said: It is written [Prov. xvii. 16]: "Wherefore is the purchase-money in the hand of a fool to acquire wisdom, seeing he hath no heart." Woe to the scholars who study the Law, and have no fear of Heaven! Said Rabba to his disciples: I pray you, that ye may not inherit

two hells (he who studies and is yet wicked, has a hell on earth, and yet will have hell after his death). R. Joshua b. Levi said: It is written [Deut. iv. 44]: "This is the law which Moses set." If he has merited, it becomes to him a medicine of life; if not, it becomes to him a poison. And this is the same which Rabba has said above (about the two hells). R. Samuel b. Na'hmain in the name of R. Jonathan finds a contradiction of the following two passages: It is written [Ps. xix. 9]: "The precepts of the Lord are upright, rejoicing the heart," and [ibid. xviii. 31]: "The word of the Lord is tried." There is, then, a contradiction. Here it is said, it rejoices, and there, it is trying? If he has merited, it rejoices him; otherwise, it is a trial to him. Said Resh Lakish: This we may infer from the same passages: "He is a shield to all those that trust in him." If he merits, it tries him, to enable him the better to live; if he does not merit, his trials kill him. It is written further [ibid. xix. 10]: "The fear of the Lord is pure, enduring forever." Said R. Hanina: That signifies, a man who studies the Law when he is pure. What is meant by pure? When he has first married a wife, and then studies. It is written [ibid. 8]: "The testimony of the Lord is sure." Said R. Hiya b. Abba: The Torah is itself a trusted witness against the students (about the manner in which they had studied it).

"*The Urim and Tumim were inquired of,*" etc. When R. Dimi came from Palestine, he said: The clothes which the high-priest wore, the priest anointed for war could also wear. Whence is it deduced? Because it is written [Ex. xxix. 29]: "And the holy garments belonging to Aaron shall be for his sons after him." What is meant by "after him"? Next to him in office, and that was the one anointed for war.

R. Adda b. A'hba, according to others K'di objected: We have learned in a Boraitha: Shall we assume that the son of the priest anointed for war shall succeed to the office of his father, as the high-priest's son does? Therefore it is written [Ex. xxix. 30]: Seven days shall that one of his sons put them on who is to be priest in his place, who is to go into the tabernacle of the congregation. That means, he who is fit to enter the tabernacle of the congregation on the Day of Atonement, which is the high-priest. (If it be according to R. Dimi, that the eight garments of the high-priest may be used by the priest anointed for war during the whole year, and that hence he is also fit to enter the tabernacle of the congregation, why should

the Boraitha say it is only the high-priest?) Said R. Na'hman b. Itz'hak: This is meant. "Who is to go into the tabernacle of the congregation" means, him who has been anointed for this, whereas that one has been anointed for war.

An objection was raised: We have learned: The priest anointed for war may neither put on the four garments, like a common priest, nor the eight, like the high-priest. Said Abayi to R. Na'hman: Do you want to make of him a layman? The Boraitha means this: Like a high-priest he is not attired, to prevent rivalry; and not like a common priest, because of the rule: In holiness one increases, but does not decrease. As while anointed for war he had eight garments on, he cannot be degraded to the level of a common priest. R. Abahu was sitting, and said the Halakha of R. Dimi in the name of R. Johanan: R. Ami and R. Ashi turned away their faces from him (to indicate that R. Johanan had not said it). When Rabbin came from Palestine, he said; It has not been said that the priest anointed for war may put on the garments, but only when he goes to consult the Urim and Tumim. We have also learned the same in the following Boraitha: The garments in which the high-priest performs the service may be used by the priest anointed for war when he consults the Urim and Tumim.

The rabbis taught: How was the ceremony of inquiring of the Urim and Tumim? The inquirer turned his face toward the priest (who inquires), but the priest's face is turned toward the Shekhina. The inquirer asks, as e.g. in 1 Samuel xxx. 8: "Shall I pursue after this troop?" And the priest answers him: "So has said the Lord. Go, and thou wilt succeed." R. Jehudah, however, said: He need not say: "So has said God." He has only to say: "Go, and thou wilt succeed."

One must not ask in a loud voice, as it is written [Num. xxvii. 21]: "And he shall ask of *him*"; no one else need hear. He should not have the question merely in his mind either, because it is written: "He shall ask of him before the Lord." (How shall he speak?) He shall ask as Hanna prayed [1 Sam. i. 13].

Two inquiries should not be made at once; and if he has made two inquiries, only one is answered, and the first. As it is written [ibid. xxiii. 11, 12]: "Will the men of Ke'ilah surrender me into his hand? Will Saul come down?" etc. And the Lord said: "He will come down." But you have said, Only the first question is answered? David asked them in a wrong

order, and he was answered in the right order. Then, when David perceived this, he asked the second question: "Will the men of Ke'ilah surrender me and my men?" And he was answered: "They will surrender." When, however, two questions must be asked at once, else it cannot be clearly understood, then the two questions are both answered. As it is written [ibid. xxx. 8]: "Shall I pursue after this troop? shall I overtake them?" And the reply is: "Pursue, for thou wilt surely overtake them, and certainly recover." And although the decision of a prophet can be revoked, the decision of the Urim and Tumim cannot be changed, as it is written [Num. xxvii. 21]: "The judgment of the Urim."

Why were they called Urim and Tumim? *Urim*, because they illuminate their words; *Tumim*, because they give a complete answer. It will be asked, Why were the Israelites beaten by the Benjamites of Gib'ah, though bidden to go to the battle by the Urim and Tumim? Because those people did not think to ask whether they would be victorious or defeated. They were answered, "Go," and they were beaten; but later, when they understood how to inquire, they received a right reply, as it is written [Judges xx. 28]: "And Phinehas the son of El'azar, the son of Aaron, stood before it in those days, saying: Shall I yet continue to go out to battle with the children of Benjamin my brother, or shall I forbear? And the Lord said: Go up, for to-morrow will I deliver him into thy hand."

How did the priest receive the reply? R. Johanan says: The letters constituting the reply became more prominent. Resh Lakish says: Nay, the letters composing the words came near each other. In the Urim and Tumim were only the names of the tribes, hence there was not the letter Tsadhe. Said R. Samuel b. R. Itz'hak: The names of "Abraham," "Itz'hak," and "Jacob" were also written there. But there was not the letter Teth? There were likewise the words "Shibtei Jeshurun" ("The Tribes of Israel": hence there was a *t*). An objection was raised: We have learned that a priest on whom the Shekhina does not rest, and is not inspired by the Holy Spirit, need not be inquired through. (How, then, is it said, the letters projected, or arranged themselves together?) Why? We see that when Zadok inquired he was answered, and Ebiathar received no reply, as it is written [2 Sam. xv. 24]: "And Ebiathar went up, until all the people had finished passing out of the city." "Went up." He resigned. The Holy Spirit enabled him to

TRACT YOMAH (DAY OF ATONEMENT). III

perceive the letters that projected, which he could not do otherwise.

"*Inquiries are not made except for a king.*" Whence do we deduce this? Said R. Abahu: As it is written [Num. xxvii. 21]: "Before Elazar the priest shall he stand, and he shall ask of him after the judgment of the Urim before the Lord . . . he and all the children of Israel with him." "He" means the king, and all Israel "with him" means, the priest anointed for war; and all the congregation means, the Sanhedrin.

CHAPTER VIII.

REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE FASTING ON THE DAY OF ATONEMENT, WHAT MAY BE DONE THEREON, AND WHAT MAY NOT BE DONE.

MISHNA: On the Day of Atonement it is forbidden to eat and to drink, to wash, to anoint, to lace on shoes, and to hold sexual intercourse. A king and a bride may wash their faces; and a lying-in woman may lace on shoes. Such is the decree of R. Eleazar. But the sages forbid it. Whosoever eats food to the size of a large date—that is, the date with the kernel—or drinks a mouthful, is guilty. All kinds of food are reckoned together to the size of the date, and all liquids to the mouthful; but food and beverages are not reckoned together.

GEMARA: In the Torah it is written, *Karothen* is the penalty; and you say, merely, it is forbidden? [Lev. xxiii. 29]. Said R. Ilia, according to others R. Jeremiah: What is said in the Mishna, "forbidden," applies to half of the prescribed quantity. This would be right according to him who says that half of the prescribed quantity is biblically forbidden, but of him who says that it is biblically allowed, what can you say? Then it was taught: A half of the prescribed quantity, R. Johanan says, is prohibited biblically; and Resh Lakish says: It is allowed biblically. Then the Mishna would be according to R. Johanan. But of Resh Lakish what can be said? Resh Lakish avows, that rabbinically it is prohibited. When it is said in the Mishna "forbidden," it is meant, forbidden rabbinically.

When *Karothen* is the penalty, is not the term "prohibited" employed? We have learned in the following Boraitha: Although the sages have said that it is prohibited in all regards, *Karothen* is due only for eating, drinking, and work. We see, then, that even when *Karothen* is the penalty, the term "prohibited" is employed? The Boraitha meant to say as follows: When the Mishna says "prohibited," it is meant for the half of the prescribed quantity; but if he has eaten the prescribed quantity, *Karothen* is due for eating and drinking, and work; but

TRACT YOMAH (DAY OF ATONEMENT). 113

not for the other actions. If you wish, I can say, when it is stated in the Mishna "prohibited," the *other* actions only are meant (hence *Karoth* is not due). Rabba and R. Joseph taught from the books of the Pentateuch other than Leviticus, as follows: Whence do we deduce that on the Day of Atonement one must not wash, anoint, lace on the shoes, and have sexual intercourse? Because it is written [Lev. xvi. 31]: "A Sabbath of rest, and ye shall afflict yourselves." What is meant by rest? Desisting from washing, anointing, etc. The text above states: Half of the prescribed quantity is biblically forbidden, according to R. Johanan? Why? Because if he will eat twice the other half, he will have eaten the whole. Resh Lakish says: The Merciful One has said "eat," and this is not called "eating."

The rabbis taught: It is written [ibid. 29]: "Ye shall afflict yourselves." Shall we assume that he should go and sit in the sunshine or in the cold, to cause himself suffering? Therefore it is written: "No work shall ye do." As about the work the prohibition is negative, so the affliction is meant to be only negative; *i.e.*, abstinence. But perhaps it is meant thereby, if he sits in sunshine or in shade, and feels too hot or too cold, they should not say to him: "Remove from this place," that he might suffer? The affliction is compared to the work: as in case of the work it matters not in which place it is, so in case of the affliction.

The disciples of R. Ishmael have taught: It is written here, "affliction," and it is written further, "affliction" [Deut. viii. 3]: ("He afflicted thee and suffered thee to hunger"). As there by affliction hunger is meant, so here. If he deduces it from an analogy of expression, let him deduce it from the expression [Gen. xxxi. 50]: "If thou shouldst afflict my daughters." It is deduced from an affliction suffered spontaneously (as hunger), but not from affliction inflicted by men.

It is written [Deut. viii. 16]: "Who hath fed thee in the wilderness with manna, which thy fathers knew not, in order to afflict thee." What was the affliction? R. Ami and R. Assi said—the one, that not to have bread ready in one's basket is an affliction, whereas the manna had to be hoped for every day; and the other says, not to see what one eats (the manna) is an affliction. (The manna had all flavors at will, but not the *appearance* of all foods whose flavors it had.) Said R. Joseph: Infer from this, that the blind are never satiated. Says Abayi: He who has to eat, therefore, should eat only by day, and not

by night. Said R. Zera: How can it be inferred from Scripture? From Ecc. vi. 9: "Better is what one seeth with the eyes than the wandering of desire." It is written [Prov. xxiii. 31]: "When he glances into the cup, it goes down smoothly." R. Ami and R. Assi said—the one, that then (when he is drunk) all blood-relations are forgotten by him; and the other says, that the whole world seems to him alike (he does not distinguish between his own and others' property). It is written [Prov. xii. 26]: "If there is care in the heart of a man, he shall suppress it." Said R. Ami and R. Assi—the one, he should suppress it, by driving it out of his thoughts; and the other, by relating about it to another person.

It is written [Is. lxv. 25]: "The serpent dust shall be his food." R. Ami and R. Assi said—the one, that whatever he eats, he tastes the flavor of earth; and the other, that whatsoever he should eat, he is not filled, unless he eats earth after it.

We have learned in a Boraitha: R. Jose said: Come and see. The visage of the Holy One, blessed be He, is not like that of a human being. When a human being incenses another, the latter tries to embitter his life; the Lord, when He cursed the serpent to eat earth, the serpent finds his food wheresoever he goes. He cursed Canaan, that it should be subjected: so it eats what its master eats, and drinks what its master drinks. He has cursed woman, and all run after her. He has cursed the earth, and the world is nourished by it.

It is written [Num. xi. 3]: "We remember the fish which we ate in Egypt." Said Rabh and Samuel—one, that simply fish is meant; and the other, licentiousness (since forbidden by the commandments). He who says "fish," says it is plainly mentioned "ate"; and the other, who says licentiousness is meant, proves it from Proverbs xxx. 20: "She eateth, and wipeth her mouth."

We have learned in a Boraitha: R. Jose said: As the prophet told the Israelites all that passed in their dwellings, and the very nooks, so the manna betrayed all their secrets. How so? For instance, two came to Moses, and one said: "He has stolen my slave," and the other said: "You sold him to me." Moses said: "In the morning we will decide it." On the morrow, if the Omer of manna for the slave was found for the one, it was a sign that the slave had been stolen; but if for the other, it was evident that he had bought him. If one came and impeached his wife of adultery, and she charged him with that crime, then

the Omer decided. If her Omer was found for her husband, it was evident that she had sinned ; if for her father, it was plain that he had sinned.

Three verses are written [Num. xv. 9]: "When the dew fell upon the camp in the night the manna fell upon it"; and [Ex. xvi. 4]: "The people shall go out, and gather"; and [Num. xi. 8]: "The people went about, and gathered it." How shall the three verses be reconciled? This is meant: For the upright, the manna came down at the door of their tents; for the general, they went out and found it; the wicked had to seek it, till they found it.

In Exodus it is written, "bread from heaven"; and [Num. xi. 4], "made cakes of it"; and [ibid.] "ground it." How shall these be reconciled? For the righteous, there was bread ready; as for the general, they made cakes of the flour; and the wicked had to grind it. It is written [Num. xi. 8]: "Its taste was as the taste of cakes mixed with oil." Said R. Abahu: As the milk of its mother has various flavors for the infant, so the manna, so long as the Israelites ate it, had for them all flavors.

It is written [Ex. xvi. 8]: "Flesh to eat, and bread in the morning to the full." It was taught in the name of R. Joshua b. Kar'ha: Because meat they asked for in an unbecoming manner, they did not receive it as was fitting, but bread which they had asked for properly, they had given to them properly. From this verse we can learn that the usage of the world ought to be that meat is to be eaten only by night. But Abayi has said above: He who has to eat a meal, should eat it only by day? He meant, when there is yet light. Said R. A'ha b. Jacob: At first the Israelites were like chickens, which eat out of the rubbish, till Moses came and fixed for them the times for the meals.

It is written "bread," "oil," "honey." What does this signify? For the young it was bread, for the old it was oil, and for the children it was honey.

The rabbis taught: It is written [Ps. lxviii. 25]: "The bread of Abirim did man eat." Said R. Aqiba: That means, the bread that angels eat. It was told to R. Ishmael. He said to them: Go and tell to Aqiba: Thou hast been in error. Do angels eat bread? It is written [Deut. ix. 9]: "Bread did I not eat, and water did I not drink." What, then, means "Abirim"? It is like "Ebrim" (members); it is absorbed by all the two hundred and forty-eight members, and no refuse is left. But it

is written [Deut. xxiii. 14]: "And a spade shalt thou have." Wherefore did they need it? That is because they purchased from the Gentiles other foods also. R. Eliezer b. Parta, however, said: Even what they bought from the Gentiles, the manna dissolved. The above verse applies to the time after they had sinned.

"*Forbidden to eat.*" To what do these five modes of affliction correspond? Said R. Hishda: To the five kinds of affliction found in the Torah: namely [Num. xxix.], "and on the tenth"; [Lev. xxiii.] "but on the tenth"; [ibid.] "a Sabbath of rest"; and [ibid. xvi.] "and a Sabbath of rest"; and [ibid.] "may it be to you." Here are only five, but in the Mishna we have learned six? Drinking is included in eating, as it is written [Deut. xiv. 23]: "And thou shalt eat . . . thy corn, of thy wine, and of thy oil," etc.

The disciples of R. Simeon b. Johai questioned him: Wherefore did not the manna descend for the Israelites once a year? He answered: I will explain it to you by a parable. There was a king who ordered that the rations of his son shall be issued but once a year; the son, then, came to see his father but once a year, [at which the king became angry, and] ordered again that the rations should be issued daily, so that the son was compelled to see his father every day. So it was with the Israelites. Whoever had four or five children, worried, and said: Perhaps no manna will descend to-morrow, and all will starve. Consequently they prayed to Heaven every day. According to others, the reason is: So they should have it fresh every day; and still others say: So they should not have to carry it on the road.

It happened long ago that R. Tarphon and R. Ishmael and the elders (of the college) were discussing the subject of manna, and R. Eliezer the Modeite, who was among them, arose and said: The manna in the desert was sixty ells high. Said R. Tarphon to him: Modeite, how much longer wilt thou gather nonsensical words, and lay them before us? He rejoined: Rabbi, I take my theory from the following passages [Gen. vii. 20]: "Fifteen cubits above them did the water prevail, and the mountains were (thus) covered." (Now let us see how it was.) Was it fifteen ells above the valleys and fifteen ells above the mountains? Did, then, the water stand like pillars? And, besides, how could the ark ascend the mountains? We must, therefore, say that when all the fountains were broken up,

etc. [ibid. 11], the water covered the earth, until it reached the top of the mountains, and over that the water was fifteen ells high. As we have a tradition, that the kindness of Heaven is much more than its affliction, and as at the affliction it is said [ibid., ibid. 11]: "And the windows of heaven were opened," and at the kindness it is written [Ps. lxxviii. 23]: "Then he ordained the skies from above, and the doors of heaven he opened"; and as we know from another tradition, that a heavenly door is equal in size to four of its windows, consequently there are eight windows in two doors (doors and windows, both plural, not less than two), and as at the affliction from two windows came water fifteen ells above the earth—therefore the manna which came from eight windows cannot be less than sixty ells high.

We have learned in a Boraitha: Issi b. Jehudah says: The manna has increased itself in height till all the kings of east and west saw it, as it is written [ibid. xxiii. 5]: "Thou preparest before me a table in the presence of my assailants."

How is it known that abstaining from washing and anointing is an affliction? Because it is written [Dan. x. 3]: "Costly food did I not eat, and flesh and wine came not in my mouth, nor did I anoint myself." What is meant by "costly food" I have not eaten? Says R. Jehudah the son of R. Samuel b. Shilath: Even bread of pure wheat he did not eat. How do we know it is thought an affliction? Because it is written further [ibid. 12]: "From the first day that thou didst set thy heart to . . . afflict thyself," etc. We have found that abstaining from anointing is an affliction, but how do we know that abstaining from washing is one? Said R. Zutra b. Tubiah: It is written [Ps. cix. 18]: "And it cometh like water within him, and like oil into his bones." But perhaps drinking is meant? It is like oil; as the oil here spoken of is used externally, so the water. If you wish, I will say, that we can infer abstaining from washing, as Itz'hak has said, from this verse [Prov. xxv. 25]: "As cold water is to a fainting soul." Here drinking is perhaps meant? That would be, if it were written "in a faint soul"; but here it is written (in Hebrew), "*on* a fainting soul." How do we know that the privation of shoes is an affliction? Said R. Na'hman b. Itz'hak: From the following passage [Jer. ii. 25]: "Prevent thy foot from being unshod, and thy throat from being thirsty," which means: Prevent thyself from sin, that thy foot be not unshod, and prevent thy

tongue from speaking vain words, that thy throat be not thirsty. How is it known that abstinence from sexual intercourse is called an affliction? Because it is written [Gen. xxxi. 50]: "If thou shouldst afflict my daughters." This means, deprive them of sexual intercourse.

The rabbis taught: It is not prohibited to wash an inconsiderable part of one's body, as the whole body. If one is soiled by clay, or any such thing, he may wash himself without apprehension. One may not anoint a part of the body any more than the whole body. But if one is sick, or has an itch, he may anoint without apprehension. The disciples of Manasseh taught: A woman may wash her hand in water, and present bread to the children, without apprehension. It was said of Shamai the Elder: He was averse to give bread to his children, even with one hand, that he should not wash it; so they decreed that he should feed them with both his hands.

The rabbis taught: When a man goes to receive his father, master, or any superior, he may walk up to his neck in water, without apprehension. The schoolmen propounded a question: How if the Master goes to receive the disciple? Come and hear; R. Itz'hak bar bar Hana said: I have seen Z'eri go in water to R. Hiya b. R. Ashi, his disciple. R. Ashi, however, said: On the contrary, R. Hiya b. Ashi went to meet Z'eri, his Master. Rabha permitted the inhabitants across the river to go through the water to watch their fruit. Abayi said to Rabha: I have a Boraitha in support of what you say. Those who keep fruit, may walk through the water, up to their necks, without fear. R. Joseph permitted the inhabitants of Be Tarbu to walk through water to come to listen to the lecture, and return through the same element. Ahayi said to him: It is right that they should come to the lecture, but why return? He said: If they were not to be allowed to return, they would not come at all. R. Jehudah and R. Samuel b. R. Jehudah stood on the bank of the River Euphrates at the passage to 'Hatzdad. Rami b. Papa stood on the other side. He cried to them: How is the law? may I cross over to you? I have to ask of you a Halakha. R. Jehudah answered: Rabha and Samuel both say one way, but one may not draw away one's hands from the skirts of one's robe (not tuck it up on his back, like a burden). R. Pinchas said in the name of R. Huna of Tziporith: The spring that issued from the Holy of Holies was at first like the antennæ of a grasshopper; by the door of the sanctuary it was like a thread of

the warp ; at the porch it was thick as a thread of the woof ; at the door of the forecourt it was as broad as the mouth of a small pitcher. [This is what we have learned in a Mishna (Midoth, ii. 4) : " R. Eliezer b. Jacob said : Water will issue in the times to come from under the sill of the Temple."] Thenceforth, it waxed in strength, and when it reached the door of David's house, it was like a streaming river, and these people bathed, as it is written [Zech. xiii. 1] : " On that day shall there be a fountain opened to the house of David . . . for cleansing from sins and for purification." Z'irah b. 'Hama was the entertainer of R. Ami, R. Assi, R. Joshua b. Levi and all rabbis of Cæsarea. R. Joseph the son of R. Joshua b. Levi said to him : Young scholar, come, I will tell thee of the good deeds thy father used to do. He had a kerchief which he used to soak in water on the eve of the Day of Atonement, and then used it on the morrow to wipe his face, hands, and feet. On the eve of the Ninth of Ab, he soaked it in water likewise, and on the morrow cleaned his eyes with it. When Rabba b. Mora came from Palestine, he related that on the eve of the Ninth of Ab, he himself was used to soak a kerchief in water, and take it out, putting it under his pillow ; on the morrow he used it for wiping his face, hands, and feet. On the eve of the Day of Atonement he did the same thing, wrung it, and on the morrow wiped his eyes with it. Said R. Jacob to R. Jeremiah b. Ta'hlipha : Thou hast related it in the reverse order that on the Day of Atonement the whole face, etc., was wiped. We have objected : On that day it is prohibited to wring it out.

R. Mnashia b. Ta'hlipha said in the name of R. Amram, quoting Rabha bar bar Hana, R. Eleazar was asked, an Elder, who sat in the college, has he to receive permission from the Nassi to declare the firstlings which have got blemishes fit for slaughtering for personal use, or not ?* [What was the point of the question the schoolmen have propounded ? (Why is the question only about the firstlings ? If he has license to decide Halakhas, those about firstlings are included ?) The point of the question was this : R. Idda b. Abbin said elsewhere : The matter of firstlings was left to the Nassi, to honor them. But in

* The law of firstlings, after the destruction of the Temple, is as follows : The firstling must be given to a priest, who has to keep it until it gets a blemish. And as he was suspected of making a blemish intentionally, it could not be slaughtered unless examined by the rabbi of the city. The latter, however, has no right to decide such a question unless he gets permission from the Nassi.

this case, when he is an elderly man, and one of the first in the college, must he also receive permission, or not?]

Then R. Zadok b. 'Haluqah arose, and said: I have seen R. Jose b. Zimra, who was an old man and prominent in the college, and he was even a degree higher than the grandfather of our Nassi, and nevertheless he received permission to decide about the firstlings. Said R. Abha to him: The case was not so: R. Jose b. Zimra was himself a priest, and the question that was propounded was this: Shall we assume that the Halakha prevails according to R. Meir, who says, "Who is suspect in a matter, must not decide upon it, nor bear testimony about it," or according to Rabhan Simeon b. Gamaliel, who says, "He is believed in reference to his colleague, but not in reference to himself"? And it was decided then that the Halakha prevails according to R. Simeon b. Gamaliel.

The same propounded another question to R. Elazar: Whether one might put on a shoe made of cork on the Day of Atonement, and R. Itz'hak b. Na'hmain rose, and said: I have seen myself R. Joshuah b. Levi wearing such shoes on the Day of Atonement, and *I* (Rabha bar bar Hana) asked him: How is it, to put on these shoes on a congregational fast for rain? He answered: There is no difference.

The rabbis taught: Children may do all these things, except putting on shoes. Why? Because it will be said: The adults have laced them on their feet. But the same is the case with the other actions? The other are necessary and usual, but a child is usually barefooted; and if it has shoes, the adults put them on its feet. As Abayi said: My mother told me that warm water and oil, for a child, is good for its growth, and also eggs and Kutah (see Pesachim, p. 68, foot-note), and also objects to break, as Rabha used to buy cracked clay vessels, and gave them to his infants, that they might break them.

"A king and a bride may wash their faces." Our Mishna is in accordance with R. Hanania b. Thradian of the following Boraitha: A king and a bride may not wash their faces. R. Hanania b. Thradian says in the name of R. Elizer: They may. A lying-in woman may not put on shoes. R. Hanania b. Thradian says she may. Why may a king? Because it is written [Is. xxxiii. 17]: "The king in his beauty shall thy eyes behold." And why a bride? Because she will otherwise displease her husband. Rabh asked R. Hiya: How long is she called a "bride"? He replied: This is as we have learned in

the following Boraitha : A bride may not be forbidden to put on even her ornaments, when she is a mourner, the first thirty days after her marriage. And why may a lying-in woman put on shoes? Because otherwise she will catch cold. Said R. Samuel: Where there is a danger of snakes, or scorpions, all may put on shoes.

"*Whosoever eats food to the size of a large date,*" etc. Said R. Jehudah: The size of a large date exceeds that of an egg, and it was certain to the rabbis that with such a quantity of food one might appease his hunger, but not with less. An objection was raised: We have learned in a Boraitha: What is the prescribed quantity of the food of a man who may join the three men necessary to say the blessing after a meal? The size of an olive. So is the decree of R. Meir. R. Jehudah says: The size of an egg. Because it is written [Deut. viii. 12]: "Thou hast eaten, and art satisfied"; and by food less than the size of an egg we cannot appease hunger. We see, then, that R. Jehudah says: One can be satisfied by food the size of an egg. Why does he say, above, of a large date? Therefore we must say, R. Jehudah must have said a large date is somewhat smaller than an egg. With food the size of an egg, one may be *satisfied*; but in this case one can still appease *hunger* with food to the size of a large date.

We have learned in a Boraitha: Rabbi said: All prescribed quantities are only of the size of an olive, except in case of defilement of eatables, about which Scripture has deviated from its rule. Therefore the sages have also altered this prescribed quantity, and a proof of this is the Day of Atonement. How has Scripture deviated in regard to them? It has said [Lev. xxiii. 29]: "Every soul that will not afflict itself." The sages have altered in this case the prescribed quantity by making it as a large date. Why could he say, the Day of Atonement is a proof? (We see, as will be written further, that Scripture has deviated in case of defilement also. Why, then, could he say, the Day of Atonement is proof?) The deviation in regard to defilement we might have thought to be the usual language of Scripture. But here, when it is said "shall not afflict itself," it is a deviation, because it might have been said: "The soul that had eaten." (What is it? It was taught :) What is the reason that an eatable subject to defilement must be of the size of an egg? Because it is written [ibid. xi. 34]: "Of all eatables which may be eaten." What is that? What is an eatable which

comes from an eatable? An egg of a hen (which can be eaten itself, as well as the hen).

"Or drinks a mouthful." Said R. Jehudah in the name of Samuel: Not a whole mouthful is meant, but so much as would make the cheek bulge out. But we have learned, a mouthful? Nay, it is meant, *as* a mouthful. The disciples of Zera opposed: Why do they say, about food "the size of a date" (equal for all), and about beverages, "a mouthful" (differing in every person)? Abayi answered: It was certain to the rabbis that food of the size of a date appeases hunger, but only that one's own mouthful of water will quench thirst, not necessarily another's mouthful.

"All kinds of food are reckoned together to the size of the date." Says R. Papa: When one has eaten meat and salt, both are reckoned. And although salt is no food, yet as salt is used with meat, it is also reckoned. Resh Lakish said: The sauce which is upon herbs is reckoned with them. Is this not self-evident? One may say, the sauce is a beverage, and not counted; hence he came to teach, that since it is only made to flavor the herbs, it is reckoned part of the dish. Resh Lakish said again: When one commits an excess in eating on the Day of Atonement, he is not culpable. What is the reason? Because it is written, "They should afflict themselves," and this afflicts him. Said R. Jeremiah in the name of Resh Lakish: A layman who has eaten to excess of the heave-offering must only pay the costs, but not one-fifth more; because it is written [ibid. xxii. 14]: "If a man eat." But eating to excess, to one's hurt, is not called eating.

"Food and beverage are not reckoned together." Who is the Tana who says so? Said R. Hisda, and also Resh Lakish: In this differ the Tanaim, in Tract M'ilah, and our Mishna is according to R. Joshua. R. Johanan says: It may be even according to the rabbis, but there they differ from R. Joshua on the point of defilement, but not from our Mishna, where the question is about appeasing hunger or thirst, for which purposes foods and beverages are not to be reckoned together.

MISHNA: If one has eaten and drunk through forgetfulness, he must bring only one sin-offering. If he has eaten and also done work, he must bring two. If he has eaten food not fit for eating, or drunk liquids not fit for drinking, as brine or fish-lye, he is not guilty.

GEMARA: Resh Lakish said: Why is there no *positive* command to afflict one's self? It is only said: "Every soul that

will *not* afflict itself, will be cut off." It could not be otherwise: If it were written, "shall not eat," instead of "will not afflict itself," then we might think, eating food of the size of an olive was also a sin. Then, should it have been written: "Beware lest you should not afflict yourselves," we might think, beware not to afflict ourselves, but go and eat!—The disciples of R. Ishmael have taught: (It is an analogy of expression.) Here it is written, "affliction," and [Deut. xxii. 24], "because he has afflicted (done violence to; in Hebrew it is the same term) the wife of his neighbor." As the penalty is preceded by a warning previously, so here the penalty (of being cut off) must have been preceded by a warning. R. A'ha b. Jacob says: (There is another analogy of expression.) Here it is written, "A Sabbath of rest," so it is like all Sabbaths; and as in cases of Sabbath there is a warning, so there must have been a warning (positive prohibition) here. R. Papa says: The Day of Atonement itself is considered as a Sabbath, as it is written [Lev. xxiii. 32]: "Your Sabbath." [It is right if R. Papa says differently from R. A'ha b. Jacob, because he does not deduce it, but finds it expressed in the same passage. But why does R. A'ha b. Jacob not say as R. Papa? R. A'ha b. Jacob requires that verse for what we have learned in the following Boraitha: It is written [ibid., ibid.]: "Ye shall afflict your souls on the ninth day of the month." Shall we assume that we should begin to fast on the ninth? Therefore it is written, "at evening." We might think, when it became entirely dark? Hence it is written, "the ninth." How then? One shall begin to fast while it is yet day. From this we infer that something from the profane must be added to the holy. This is when the Day of Atonement arrives, but how do we know that is so when it departs? Therefore it is written, "from evening to evening." This we know about the Day of Atonement, but about other Sabbaths? Therefore it is written further, "shall ye rest" (Tishb'thu). How do we know about other holidays? Because it is written, "your Sabbaths." From this we deduce that whenever "rest" is enjoined, some portions of the profane day must be super-added to the holy days. But that Tana who infers all these things from the following verse [ibid. 28], "No manner of work shall ye do on this same day," that the penalty is due for violating the day itself, but not the additions made thereto, and this above implies that there are additions, what will he make of these verses? He needs these verses for what R. Hiya b.

Rabh of Diphthi has taught, as follows: It is written: "Ye shall fast on the ninth." Do we fast on the ninth? We fast on the tenth. This comes to teach, that he who eats and drinks on the ninth, the verse makes him equal (in merit) to him who would fast the ninth and the tenth.]

"If he has eaten food not fit for eating." Rabha said: If he has chewed pepper or ginger during the Day of Atonement, he is not culpable. The rabbis taught: If he has eaten leaves of *reeds* he is guiltless; but twigs of vines, he is guilty. What is meant by twigs of vines? Said R. Itz'hak of Magdala: Those that flourish between the first day of the year and the Day of Atonement. R. Kahna says: All the thirty days. We have learned in a Boraitha, as R. Itz'hak of Magdala has said: If he has eaten leaves of *reeds* he is guiltless; of twigs of vines, he is guilty. What are twigs of vines? Such as flourish between the beginning of the year and the Day of Atonement.

"If he has drunk . . . brine as fish-lye." How if he has drunk vinegar? He is guilty? We must say our Mishna is according to Rabbi in a Boraitha which says vinegar refreshes a man.

R. Gidel b. Menasseh of Biri d'Narash once lectured: The Halakha does not prevail according to Rabbi: when the Day of Atonement arrived, the whole world mixed vinegar with water, and drank. R. Gidel heard of this; he became indignant. He said: I have said, when it has been drunk already, one is not culpable, but have not recommended it. I meant a little, but did not mean much. I spoke of vinegar, but not of mixed vinegar.

MISHNA: Children are not made to fast on the Day of Atonement, but when one or two years old they are accustomed to do it, so that they become habituated to obey the religious commandments.

GEMARA: If it is stated "two years," *one* is understood? Said R. Hisda: It presents no difficulty. The one applies to a healthy child; the other, to a weakly child. R. Huna said: When the child is eight or nine years old, it may be accustomed to fast some hours. When it becomes ten or eleven years old, it may be made to fast rabbinically the whole day. A girl must fast biblically at the age of twelve. R. Na'hman, however, said: When nine or ten years old—some hours; at eleven or twelve—rabbinically the whole day; at thirteen—biblically, a boy. R. Johanan says: So long as it is rabbinical, they need not fast the entire day. Only at ten or eleven they must be habituated to

fast for hours, and at twelve they must fast the whole day bibli-
cally.

MISHNA: A pregnant woman, who longs for food which she smells, should be fed until relieved. An invalid is fed by the direction of persons possessing medical knowledge; if there be none such, he is to be fed at his own desire, till he says, "Enough."

The rabbis taught: If a pregnant woman has smelled sacred meat, or pork, something should be dipped in the sauce thereof, and presented to her mouth. If she is relieved thereby, it is good; otherwise, the sauce must be given to her. If this has not satisfied her either, the meat itself must be given to her. Because nothing is prohibited which is needed to save a life, except idolatry, adultery, and bloodshed.

It happened to a pregnant woman that she smelled food. They came to ask Rabbi. He said: Go, tell her in her ear, To-day is the Day of Atonement. They did thus, and she became composed. Rabbi said of this child the verse in Jeremiah [i. 5]: "Before yet I had formed thee in thy mother's body I knew thee." That child became R. Johanan. The same accident happened to another woman. They came to ask R. Hanina. He said the same; but it availed not. He said of him the verse [Ps. lviii. 4]: "The wicked are estranged from the womb"; and this child became Sabbathai, who used to buy fruits to sell in time of dearth (and this is forbidden in Palestine).

"An invalid is fed," etc. Said R. Janai: When the invalid says, "I must eat," and the physician says he need not, the patient is obeyed. Why? Because it is written [Prov. xiv. 10]: "The heart knoweth its own bitterness." Is this not self-evident? We might think the physician has a better comprehension of the patient's needs. He chooses to teach us; it is not so. How, if the case is reversed? Then the physician is obeyed, because the patient only fancies he does not need to eat.

An objection has been made to our Mishna: If no medical persons are there, he is fed at his own desire. Hence, when there are such, he is not to be fed at his own desire? The Mishna means: When the patient says he does *not* need to eat, then he is not fed at the recommendation of medical persons; but if he says he *does* need to eat, no one is to be consulted.

MISHNA: If a man is seized with bulimy, he may be fed even with unclean food, till his eyes become clear. One who is bitten by a mad dog may not have the dog's midriff above

the liver given to him. R. Mathia b. Harash allows it. Moreover, R. Mathia b. Harash also said: "If a person has a sore throat, it is permitted to put drugs into his throat on Sabbath, because the disease may endanger his life, and whatsoever threatens to endanger life supersedes Sabbath."

If a building tumble down, and it is doubtful whether any one is buried beneath the ruins or not; if it is doubtful whether he be dead or alive, it is permitted to remove the ruins from above him on the Sabbath. If he be found alive, the ruins are to be entirely removed; but should he be dead, he is to be left there.

GEMARA: The rabbis taught: Till his eyes become clear. How is it known when his eyes are clear? When he regains his reason to distinguish between good and evil. Said Abayi: Good and evil in taste is meant.

The rabbis taught: He who has been seized by bulimy must be fed with less strictly prohibited foods. For instance, if there is grain from which the heave-offering has not yet been separated, and carrion, he must be given the carrion (as for eating the first the penalty is death from Heaven). When there is such grain and grain of a Sabbatical year, he must be given the latter. When there is that grain, and the heave-offering itself, then there is a difference of opinion between the Tanaim of the following Boraitha: They may give him the grain from which the heave-offering has not been separated, but not the heave-offering itself. R. Thema said: The heave-offering, but not that grain. (The heave-offering is less strictly prohibited because a priest may eat thereof, but of other kind even a priest may not eat.)

The rabbis taught: He who is seized by bulimy must be fed on honey, and other sweet things, as these things make the eyes clear. And although there is no support thereto in the Bible, yet it is written in proof of it [1 Sam. xiv. 29]: "My eyes have become clear because I have tasted a little of this honey." Why is this no support? Because Jonathan had not been seized by bulimy. Said Abayi: This must be given after his repast, but if it be given to him before he has received the food, it will only increase his hunger. As it is written [ibid. xxx. 11, 12]: "And they found an Egyptian man in the field, and took him to David, and gave him bread and he did eat; and they made him drink water; and they gave him a piece of a cake of fig, and two clusters of raisins, and he ate, and then his spirit returned

to him, for he had not eaten any bread, nor drunk any water, three days and three nights."

R. Na'hman said in the name of Samuel: He who has been seized by bulimy should be given the fat of a sheep's tail in honey. R. Huna the son of R. Joshua said: Fine flour with honey is also good. R. Papa says, even barley flour with honey.

R. Johanan said: Bulimy once seized me. I ran to the eastern side of a date palm, and ate the dates. I fulfilled in my own person one verse [Eccl. vii. 12]: "Wisdom giveth life to him who possesseth it." [As R. Joseph has taught: He who desires to feel the real taste of dates, should take them from the eastern side of the palm, as it is written [Deut. xxxiii. 14]: "And through precious fruit, brought forth by the sun" (east).]

R. Jehudah and R. Jose were on the road. R. Jehudah was seized by bulimy. He overpowered a shepherd, and robbed him of his bread. Said to him R. Jose: Thou hast robbed the shepherd! When they came to the city, R. Jose was seized by bulimy. He was overladen with food and sweet things. R. Jehudah said to him: I have only robbed the shepherd, but thou—the whole city. It happened again that R. Meir, R. Jehudah, and R. Jose were on the road. R. Meir was particular about the names of his innkeepers, but the other two were not. When they arrived at an inn, they asked the host: What is thy name? He answered: "Kidor." R. Meir thought: He must be a wicked man, because it is written [Deut. xxxii. 20]: "*Ki dor tah puchoth hema*"—"for a perverse generation are they." R. Jehudah and R. Jose intrusted him with their purses for safe-keeping over Sabbath, and R. Meir did not, but hid it in Kidor's father's sepulchre. Then his father appeared in a dream to Kidor, and told him: "Go and take away the purse that is over my head." Kidor rose in the morning, and told everybody of his dream. They said to him: A dream dreamed on the eve of Sabbath has no significance. Nevertheless, R. Meir kept watch over his money the whole day, and by night removed it. On the morrow R. Jehudah and R. Jose required of Kidor their purses. He said to them: You have never given them to me! R. Meir then said to them: Why were you not particular about names? They said to him: Why has the Master not told us about it? He replied: I say, such men ought only to be suspect, but I could not have said with certainty. Finally, they took him to a store. They perceived he had lentils on his mustache. They went to his wife, and told her that her husband had eaten that

day lentils, and she should give them their money. She returned their purses to them, and they went away. He (Kidor) then went and murdered his wife. And this is what a Boraitha states: The failure to wash his hands before the meal caused a man to eat pork (as he was taken for this reason in the inn for a Gentile); and after the meal, caused a murder.

"One bitten by a mad dog." The rabbis taught: Five things have been mentioned as symptoms of a dog's madness: his mouth is opened, his saliva flows, his ears are lowered, and the tail is held between his thighs, and he ever takes the bypaths; and others say, he barks spasmodically. We have learned in a Boraitha: He must be killed by an arrow, or other projectile, for whoever touches him becomes dangerously sick, and who is bitten, dies. What are the remedies? He whose clothes have been touched by the dog, should cast them off, and run away.

R. Huna the son of R. Joshua happened to be rubbed against by a rabid dog; he stripped himself, and ran away, and said: I have fulfilled in my own person the verse: "Wisdom giveth life to him who possesseth it." What is the remedy for a bite? Says Abayi: He should fetch the hide of a hyena, and inscribe on it: "I, So-and-So, son of the woman So-and-So, have inscribed on the hide of a male hyena, I have inscribed on it thus: *Kanti Kanti Qlirus*"; others say: "*Kandi Kandi Qlirus; Yo, Yo, Yehovah Tsebaoth. Amen, Amen. Selah.*" Then he should strip himself of his clothes, and inter them for twelve months; then he should take them out, burn them in an oven, and spread the ashes on the roads. During these twelve months he should drink water only out of copper vessels, that he should not see the image of the dog, as from this he may become dangerously sick. In the case of Abba b. Martha, who is Abba b. Minyumi, to whom this happened, his mother made for him a golden pitcher to drink out of it.

"R. Mathiah b. Heresh said also," etc. R. Johanan had the scurvy. He went to a matron of Rome. She did something to relieve him on a Thursday and the eve of Sabbath. He asked her, What shall I do on Sabbath? She said: You will not need to do anything. He said: But if, notwithstanding, I should be obliged to do something? She said: Swear to me that you will not tell of it to anyone, so I shall tell you. [After this, when she had told him, he went and lectured about it to everybody. But he had sworn not to tell? He had sworn, "To the God of Israel I will not reveal"; but to the people of

Israel he could. But this deception was a profanation of God's name? He had told her immediately thereupon: I had sworn not to say it to God, but to Israel I would. What was it that she told him? Said R. A'ha the son of R. Ammi: Water of leavened dough, olive oil, and salt. R. Yemar says: Not the water, but leavened dough itself, olive oil, and salt. R. Ashi says: Fat of the wing of a goose. Said Abayi: I have used all these things, and was not cured until an Arab merchant said: The stones of olives, one-third grown, should be taken and burned in a new Mar, and be applied to the rows of the teeth. This I have done, and have been cured. What causes such a sickness? Eating of hot wheat bread, or the remains of a dish of *Haisana* (fish fried in oil) from the previous evening. What are its symptoms? When something is put on the teeth they begin to bleed.] R. Johanan did it on the Sabbath and was cured. How did R. Johanan do this? His life was not threatened? R. Na'hman b. Itz'hak said: Scurvy begins in the mouth and ends in the entrails. Said R. Hiya b. Abha to R. Johanan: Do you hold, then, as R. Mathiah b. Heresh, who says: If one has a sore mouth, it is permitted? He said: Yea, for I say, to put drugs into his mouth. In regard to this sickness the sages agree with him, but about other diseases they do not. Come and hear in support of this: Rabba b. Samuel taught: A pregnant woman, who smells food, should be fed till relieved. One bitten by a mad dog should be fed on the midriff of its liver; and he who has a sore mouth may have medicines put into it on Sabbath. So has said R. Eliezer b. Jose in the name of R. Mathiah b. Heresh. And the sages say: In this case, but not other cases. Which case? Should we say, that of the pregnant woman, there are none differing about it; if of the mad dog, they are at variance about it. Hence the putting in of medicines is meant. Said R. Ashi: From our Mishna we can perceive it; for all the things about which the sages and R. Mathiah are at a variance are mentioned before, and then it is said: "R. Mathiah b. Heresh said also," and the rabbis do not differ with him. Now, if it were something from which the rabbis differed, it would be mentioned above, among the other things.

"*Whatsoever threatens to endanger life supersedes Sabbath.*" Why has this to be mentioned again? Said R. Jehudah in the name of Rabh: Not only when it is doubtful whether his life is threatened this Sabbath, but even the next, it is allowed. How

can this happen? *E.g.*, when it has been estimated on a Sabbath that the patient must take the remedy the next eight days, lest it be said: The evening will be waited for; so that only the next Sabbath will have to be violated, it comes to teach us it is not so. We have learned thus in a Boraitha: Warm water has to be heated for a patient, whether for drinking or to wash him, even when the consequences of these measures will be felt the next Sabbath. It should not be said: It will be delayed, perhaps these remedies will not be needful; but immediately he must get them, because the danger to life supersedes Sabbath, not only if the danger is this Sabbath, but *will* be the next Sabbath. But these things must not be done through Gentiles as Samaritans, but the greatest Israelites. But such things must not be done when neither the physician nor the patient says this is necessary, but only women as Samaritans. But their opinion is added to give weight to others' opinions.

The rabbis taught: The Sabbath is superseded when life is threatened; and with more alacrity this is done, the greater the praise. Permission from Beth Din need not be taken for it. How so? When a child is seen to have fallen into the sea, it should be fished for immediately; and the sooner one does this, the more praiseworthy one is; and no permission from Beth Din is to be taken for it, even when he will take up in the net at the same time game fish. If one has seen a child fall into a pit, he may remove a piece of earth to save it the sooner. The more quickly he does it, the more praiseworthy he is, and though he forms by this means a staircase, he need not take license from Beth Din. If he saw a child enter, behind which the door got locked, he should break open the door immediately, and the sooner the better; and he need not take permission from Beth Din, even when by this means he breaks it for kindling. If he has perceived a fire kindled on Sabbath, he should extinguish it immediately; and the sooner the better, and even when the coals he saves from consumption will be used by him later for roasting meat.

"If a building tumble down." How is it to be understood? It is meant to say, that not only when it is doubtful whether one is there, and lives, or is not there; but even when the uncertainty is whether, being there, he lives, or is dead, nevertheless the ruins are to be removed. If he is found alive, the ruins are entirely cleared. Is this not self-evident? The Mishna means to say, when it is known that he is dying, still the ruins are to be removed. If he is dead, he is to be left. Is not this also

self-evident? This is to teach us that it is not according to R. Jehudah b. Lakish of the following Boraitha: Sabbath is not superseded to save a corpse from fire. R. Jehudah b. Lakish, however, said: I have heard, a corpse may be saved from fire, even on Sabbath. But even according to R. Jehudah b. Lakish, a corpse is to be saved only from fire; because otherwise he to whom the corpse is dear will extinguish the fire. But in this case, even when the dead body is dear to him, what can he do (to violate the Sabbath)?

The rabbis taught: When the body under the ruins seems dead, what members are to be brought to light and examined? As far as the nose. Others say, as far as the heart. When it does not beat, he is taken to be dead. But if one has commenced with examining the head and heart, and found them defunct, one should nevertheless bring to light the other parts, and examine them. As it happened, that the upper parts were dead, and yet the lower had still some life, said R. Papa: The sages differ when one has commenced the examination from below upwards; but from above downwards, that is, when the nose has been found to have ceased breathing, no further examination is needed, as it is written [Gen. vii. 22]: "All in whose nostrils was the breath of life." It happened long ago that R. Ishmael, R. Aqiba, and R. Eliezer b. Azariah were on the road; and Levi, the Sadar, or Sarad,* and R. Ishmael the son of R. Eliezer b. Azariah followed them. They were asked the following question: How is it known that, when life is in danger, Sabbath may be violated? R. Ishmael answered: It is written [Ex. xxii. 2]: "If a thief be found while breaking in and be smitten so that he die, there shall no blood be shed for him." We can deduce, *a fortiori*, from this: If in this case, when it is doubtful whether he had come to steal only, or to murder, yet taking his life is permitted, although bloodshed defiles the land and causes the Shekhina to remove from Israel, how much more is violation of the Sabbath (less important than bloodshed) permitted to save a human life.

R. Jonathan b. Joseph says: From the following verse: Of Sabbath it is written [Ex. xxxi. 14]: "For it is holy unto you." *Unto you*: The Sabbath is for you, but not you for the Sabbath. R. Simeon b. Menasseh says: It is written [ibid. 16]: "And the

* According to one "Aruch," it is the maker of the clothes of service (Bigde S'rad).

children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath." The Torah enjoins thus: Violate one Sabbath, that ye may keep many Sabbaths. R. Jehudah said: Samuel has said: If I had been there, I would have said a thing better than this; namely, it is written [Lev. xviii. 5]: "Ye shall keep my statutes . . . which, if a man do, he shall live by them." He shall live by them, but not die. Said Rabba: All the verses from which they have deduced it may be questioned, but to Samuel's nothing can be objected. Rabbina, and according to others R. Na'hman b. Itz'hak, has said of this: One grain of pungent pepper is better than a whole basket of cucumbers.

MISHNA: Sin-offerings and trespass-offerings atone. Death and the Day of Atonement, if one is penitent, atone. Penitence atones for slight breaches of positive or negative commandments; for grave sins, it effects a suspension, till the Day of Atonement completes the atonement. To him who says: "I will sin, repent, sin again, and repent again," is not given the opportunity to repent. For him who thinks, "I will sin; the Day of Atonement will atone for my sins," the Day of Atonement does not atone. A sin towards God, the Day of Atonement atones for; but a sin towards his fellowman is not atoned for by the Day of Atonement so long as the wronged fellowman is not righted. R. Eliezer b. Azariah lectured: It is written [Lev. xvi. 30]: "From all your sins before the Lord shall ye be clean." (This is our tradition.) The sin towards God, the Day of Atonement atones for; but sins toward man, the Day of Atonement cannot atone for till the neighbor has been appeased.

Said R. Aqiba: Happy are ye, O Israel. Before whom do ye cleanse yourselves, and who cleanses you? Your Father who is in Heaven. For it is written [Ezek. xxxvi. 25]: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean"; and it is also written: "The Migveh (hope, or legal bath) of Israel is the Lord." As a legal diving-bath purifies the unclean, so does the Holy One, blessed be He, cleanse Israel.

GEMARA: "*Death and the Day of Atonement,*" etc. Only when one is penitent, but otherwise they do not atone? Shall we assume that the Mishna is not in accordance with Rabbi, in the following Boraitha: "Rabbi says: All sins mentioned in the Bible, whether one is penitent or not, are atoned by the Day of Atonement, except throwing off the yoke (of God), expounding the Torah falsely, and abolition of circumcision (and mocking a fellowman). These sins are atoned for by the Day of Atone-

ment, if one is penitent, but not otherwise." It may be said even that the Mishna is in accordance with Rabbi: Penitence is supplemented by the Day of Atonement or Death, but the Day of Atonement does atone alone.

"*Penitence atones for slight breaches, if positive or negative,*" etc. Why has it to be told, positive? If negative, so much the more positive? Said R. Jehudah: The Mishna meant to say, a positive commandment, or a negative commandment inferred from a positive. But a real negative commandment is not atoned? There is a contradiction from the following Boraitha: What are called slight sins? A breach of a positive and negative commandment, except the negative commandment [Ex. xx. 7]: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain"; and all things equal to this: since this, which is a real negative commandment, is excepted, the other negative commandments are atoned for? Come and hear another contradiction: It is written [Ex. xxxiv. 7]: "And he will clear of sins." We might think, from this sin, the breach of the negative commandment, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord," etc., he will also clear. Therefore it is further written, "by no means." Shall we assume, that from the breaches of all negative commandments he will not clear? Therefore it is written [Ex. xx. 7]: "For the Lord will not hold him guiltless (the Hebrew term is the same) that taketh *His name* in vain." Infer from this, that breaches of other negative commandments he does atone for? (How, then, does Jehudah say that the breaches of real negative commandments are not atoned for?) There is a difference of opinion among the Tana'im, as we have learned in the following Boraitha: "What does penitence atone for? For breaches of positive, and negative inferred from positive, commandments. And for which does penitence only gain a suspension, and the Day of Atonement atones? The sins for which the penalties are *Karoth*, death by Beth Din, and real negative commandments."

The Master has said: Because it is written [Ex. xxxiv. 7]: "He will clear of sins," how is it to be understood? That is as we have learned in the following Boraitha: R. Elazar said: We cannot say it means, He clears of sins, because it is written further, "by no means" does He clear. We cannot say, He does not, because it is written "clear of sins."* We must therefore

* The literal translation is: "And clear he will not clear."

explain the verse : He clears of sins those who do penance ; and does not, those who are not penitent.

R. Mathiah b. Heresh asked R. Elazar b. Azariah at Rome : Have you heard of the four differences made in atonements, about which R. Ishmael lectured ? He replied to him : There are only three, and penitence is combined with each. When one has transgressed a positive commandment, and done penance, he is atoned for before he goes away from his place. As it is written [Jerem. iii. 14] : "Return, O backsliding children." If he has transgressed a negative commandment, penitence suspends (the sentence), and the Day of Atonement atones. As it is written [Lev. xvi. 30] : "For on that day shall he make atonement for you, to cleanse you from all your sins." If he has committed sins for which the penalties are *Karoth*, or death by Beth Din, then penitence and the Day of Atonement suspend (the sentence in Heaven) and afflictions wipe it out. As it is written [Ps. lxxxix. 33] : "Then will I visit with the rod their transgressions, and with plagues their iniquity." But he who has on his conscience the defamation (profaning) of God, neither penitence can suspend, nor the Day of Atonement atone for, nor sufferings wipe out. But all the three only suspend, and death wipes out, as it is written [Is. xxii. 14] : "And it was revealed in my ears by the Lord of hosts : Surely this iniquity shall not be forgiven unto you, until ye die."

What is called defamation of God ? Says Rabh : For instance, if I take meat from the butcher, and do not immediately pay, I profane God (by its being said, a great and religious man robs). Says Abayi : This is when it is the custom to pay cash, but not where it is the usage to pay later. R. Johanan says : For instance, when I should walk four ells without Torah (in my mind), I profane God. R. Janai's disciples have said : When a man's companions are ashamed of his reputation, it profanes God. Said R. Na'hman b. Itz'hak : (What is meant by reputation ?) When people say of a man : "O God, pardon him for his deeds." And Abayi says, as we have learned in the following Boraitha : It is written [Deut. vi. 5] : "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God." That means, God's name should be loved through thee; that is to say, a man must read and study the Torah, and attend on (serve) scholars, and his dealings with the world should be mild. What do people then say of him ? Well with his father, who taught him Torah ; well with his teacher, who has instructed him in Torah, and woe to those peo-

ple who have not learned the Law! Behold, the one who *has* learned Torah, how beautiful are his ways, how just his deeds! Of him says the verse [Is. xl ix. 3]: "And he said unto me, My servant art thou, O Israel, thou on whom I will be glorified." But if one has learned Torah and served the scholars, but is in his dealings not honest and speaks with people not gently, then what do people say about him? Behold, him who has learned Torah, woe to his father, that has taught him Torah; woe to his teacher, who has instructed him in Torah! See the one who has learned Torah, how evil are his ways, how evil his deeds! Of him says the verse [Ezek. xxxvi. 20]: "They profane my holy name, because they said of them, these are the people of the Lord, and out of his land are they gone forth."

R. Hania b. Hanina said: Penitence is great, and brings healing to the world, as it is written [Hosea xiv. 5]: "I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely." The same has found a contradiction: It is written [Jerem. iii. 14]: "Return, O backsliding children"; by which seems to be implied a former backsliding. And here it is written: "I will heal thy backsliding," where it seems to be implied that it will remain, only be healed. It presents no difficulty. When one does penance out of love towards God, he is as he had not been; but if he does penance only out of fear, his previous sins remain, only they are healed.

R. Jehudah finds a contradiction: In these verses it is written, "backsliding children," and elsewhere [Jerem. iii. 14]: "For I am become your husband and will take you." It presents no difficulty. Children they are called, when they do penance out of love or fear; and otherwise, when they do it through suffering.*

R. Levi said: Penitence is great. It reaches the throne of His glory, as it is written [Hosea xiv. 2]: "Return, O Israel, even unto the Lord thy God." R. Johanan said: Penitence is great, so that it supersedes a negative commandment in the Torah. As it is written [Jerem. iii. 3]: "One could say, Behold, if a man send away his wife, and she go from him, and become another man's, can he return unto her again? Would not that land be greatly polluted? and thou hast played the harlot with many companions, and wilt yet return to me, saith the Lord." (So penitence is greater than the commandment not to take back one's wife, married to another.)

* The passage is difficult, and Rashi is also uncertain. .

R. Jonathan said: Penitence is great, so that it brings the redemption, as it is written [Is. lix. 20]: "But unto Zion shall come the redeemer, and unto those who return from transgression in Jacob," which means, Why is the redeemer come? Because Jacob has returned from transgressions. Resh Lakish says: Penitence is great: even the sins that have been done intentionally are considered as if they had been done unintentionally. As it is written [Hosea xiv. 2]: "For thou hast stumbled in thy iniquity." Iniquity is intentional, and yet it is called "stumbling." This is not so? Did not Resh Lakish himself say: Penitence is great, so that intentional sins come to be considered as merits, as it is written [Ezek. xxxiii. 19]: "And when the wicked returneth from his wickedness, and executeth justice and righteousness, he shall surely live for them"? It presents no difficulty. One is from love, and the other from fear. R. Samuel b. Na'hmani in the name of R. Jonathan says: Penitence is great. It causes man to live long, as it is written: [ibid., ibid.]: "He shall surely live." R. Itz'hak said: In Palestine, they say in the name of Rabha b. Mari as follows: Come and see. The ways of the Holy One, blessed be He, are not like the ways of a man. When a man had incensed another man by his speech, it is doubtful whether he has really appeased him or not; but the Holy One, blessed be He, even if a man commits a sin in secret, allows himself to be appeased, as it is written [Hosea xix. 3]: "Take with you words, and return to the Lord." And not this alone, but He takes it as a favor, as it is written [ibid., ibid.]: "Accept good"; and not this only, but the verse makes him equal to one who has sacrificed bullocks, as it is written at the end of the verse: "Let us repay the steers with our lips." Perhaps it will be thought like steers as sin-offerings. Therefore it is written [ibid. 5]: "I will heal their backsliding, I will love them voluntarily."

We have learned in a Boraitha: R. Meir used to say: Repentance is great: when an individual repents, the whole world is pardoned, as it is written: "I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely; for my anger is turned away from them."* It is not said from them, but from us, from all of us.

What is a penitent man? Said R. Jehudah: When he had an opportunity to do a sin once, and a second time he did not

* The Hebrew for "from them" is "Mehem," but here "Mimenu" ("from us") is used.

do it. The same explains: That is meant, the same woman, the same place, the same time. R. Jehudah said again: Rabh found a contradiction in the following passages: It is written [Ps. xxxii. 1]: "Happy is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered," and [Prov. xxviii. 13]: "He that concealeth his transgressions will not prosper." It presents no difficulty: This refers to a sin publicly known: he ought to confess, and repent; but that refers to one not yet known; he ought to repent before it has become known. R. Zutra b. Tubia said in the name of R. Na'hman: The one refers to a sin toward a man: he must make it public, and appease the man; but a sin toward God, one need not make public, but repent.

We have learned in a Boraitha: R. Jose b. R. Jehudah said: When a man sins the first time he is pardoned; the second time, he is pardoned; the third time, he is pardoned; the fourth time, he is not pardoned, as it is written [Amos ii. 6]: "Thus hath said the Lord, For three transgressions of Israel, and for four, will I not turn away their punishment." And it is written [Job xxxiii. 29]: "Lo, all these things doth God two or three times with man." [What is the second passage required for? From the first we might think it is only the case with a congregation; but the second shows to us that it is true in case of an individual also.]

The rabbis taught: The sins one has confessed on one Day of Atonement, he need not confess on the next Day of Atonement. This is the case, if he has not repeated the sin; but in that case, he should repeat the confession. If, without having sinned again, he confessed again, then to him applies the verse [Prov. xxvi. 11]: "As a dog returneth to his vomit, so doth a fool repeat his folly." R. Eliezer b. Jacob, however, said: So much the more may he be praised, as it is written [Ps. li. 5]: "For of my transgressions I have full knowledge, and my sin is before me continually."

When he confesses, he must specify his sin, as it is written [Ex. xxxii. 31]: "This people hath sinned a great sin, and they have made themselves a god of gold." So said R. Jehudah b. Babha. R. Aqiba, however, said: "Happy is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered." [Why, then, has Moses specified the sin? It is, according to R. Janai: Moses said to the Holy One, blessed be He: "Lord of the universe, thou hast given so much gold that they said, 'Enough.' This has caused that they made a golden god."]

Two good leaders Israel had: Moses and David. Moses said: May my sins be inscribed, as it is written [Num. xxii. 12]: "Because ye have not confided in me, to sanctify me." And David said: May my sins not be inscribed; namely, "Happy is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered."

Moses and David may be compared to two women punished in court: one, because she has really sinned, and the other, because she has eaten fruit of the Sabbatical year. The second said: Pray, proclaim what my transgression is, that it should not be thought I am punished for the same sin as the other woman. They took the fruit, and suspended it on her neck, and proclaimed: Be it known, she has been chastised for eating fruit of the Sabbatical year.

The evil deeds of hypocrites should be made public, that the name of the Lord may not be profaned. As it is written [Ezek. iii. 20]: When a righteous man doth turn from his righteousness and doeth what is wrong, then will I lay a stumbling-block before him."

When a confirmed sinner repents, the execution of the punished is not carried out, even after the decree has been sealed.

The mirth of the wicked ends in sin; and the possession of power (dominion) buries him who yields it. Naked he enters, and naked he comes out. Were he but as clean when he goes out as when he came in! He who is given to philanthropic activity, him sin reaches not; and he who induces the public to sin, to him is not given from Heaven the opportunity to repent. The first is not allowed (from Above) to sin, that he may not be in Gehenna while his disciples are in Paradise, as it is written [Ps. xvi. 10]: For Thou wilt not abandon my soul to the grave, Thou wilt not suffer Thy pious to see corruption; and the second is not permitted to repent, that he should not be in Paradise while his disciples will be in Gehenna, as it is written [Prov. xxviii. 17]: "A man oppressed by the load of having shed human blood will flee even to the pit: they shall not support him."

"I will sin, the Day of Atonement will atone." Shall we assume that our Mishna is not in accordance with Rabbi, who said in the following Boraitha: All the sins mentioned in the Bible, whether one has repented or not, are forgiven on the Day of Atonement? The Mishna may be according to Rabbi; but if he sins, *relying* on the Day of Atonement to atone for his sins, then Rabbi also agrees that he is not pardoned.

"Transgressions towards God." R. Joseph b. Habu pointed to a contradiction to R. Abahu: Here it is said: The sins against men the Day of Atonement does not atone for. But is it not written [2 Sam. ii. 25]: "If one man sin against another, God will forgive him when he will pray"? Not God is meant [Elohim, God or Judge], but the Judge; and by "Upil'lo," not "will forgive for prayer" is meant, but "shall punish." If it is so, what means what is written further, "If against the Lord a man should sin, who shall judge him?" (Cannot God himself judge him?) This is meant: If one sins against a man, and appeases him, God forgives; but if he sins against God, who can *pray* for him (not *judge*)? Repentance and good deeds.

R. Itz'hak said: He who has provoked his neighbor, even by words, must appease him, as it is written [Prov. vi. 1, etc.]: "My son, if thou hast become surety for thy friend," etc., "go hasten to him and urge thy friend," which means, if thou hast his money, open thy palm, and restore it to him; if not, request some persons to pray him to forgive thee. Said R. Hisda: He must try to appease him three times, and among three circles of persons, as it is written [Job xxxiii. 27]: "He then should assemble men around, and say, I have sinned, and perverted what is right, yet have I not received a like return" (three verbs: "sinned," etc.).

R. Jose b. Hanina said: When one tries to appease another, he need not try more than three times, as it is written [Gen. l. 17]: Oh, I pray Thee, forgive, I pray Thee, the trespass of thy brothers, and their sin, for evil have they done unto Thee, and now we pray Thee, forgive ("pray Thee" repeated three times). And if the offended person is dead, he should bring ten persons to his grave and say: I have sinned against God and him who lies here.

R. Jeremiah had been not on quite good terms with R. Abha: he went to appease him. He sat down on the threshold. The servant-maid came out to empty dirty water, and bespattered him. He said: I was made like unto mud, and applied unto himself the verse [1 Sam. ii. 8]: "From the dunghill he lifteth up the needy." When R. Abha heard about this, he came out and said: Now I have to ask forgiveness of you, as it is written: "Go hasten to him, and urge thy friend."

When R. Zara was on bad terms with any person, he passed him repeatedly, that the other might recollect and appease him. Rabh once had a quarrel with a butcher. When the eve of the

Day of Atonement arrived, the butcher did not come to ask his forgiveness. Rabh said : If he does not come to me I will go to him to ask his forgiveness. On the road, R. Huna met him, and inquired of him : Whither goes the Master? He said : I go to appease that man. Then R. Huna said to himself : Abha (*i.e.*, Rabh) is going to kill a man. Meanwhile Rabh came to the butcher, who was cleaving heads of cattle. When the latter raised his eyes and perceived Rabh, he said : Abha, is that thou? Go away, I don't want to have any dealings with thee. When he resumed the cleaving of the heads, a bone flew out, and stuck in his throat, so that he died.

Rabh read a section from the Prophets before Rabbi. In the meantime R. Hiya entered. Rabh began again from the beginning. Then entered Bar Kapara. He began from the beginning again. Later came R. Simeon the son of Rabbi. He read from the beginning once more. Then came R. Hanina b. Hama. He said : Shall I begin again from the beginning, after so many times? and he did not do it. R. Hanina was provoked by this. Rabh went to him thirteen eves of the Day of Atonement, and yet that man did not permit himself to be appeased. How did he do it? Did not R. Joseph b. Hanina say : More than three times one need not try? Rabh is different. He treated himself more rigorously. How did R. Hanina do so? R. Hanina saw in a dream that Rabh was hanged on a tree, and there is a tradition, if one dreams of a man that is hanged, he will become a head. He said : If I will not permit myself to be appeased, he will go to Babylon, and become a head (of a college) there, and I will become one here."

The rabbis taught : The duty of confession is on the eve of the Day of Atonement, when it grows dark. Still, the rabbis said, one should confess previously to the meal; for if something happen to him at his meal, he will have remained without a confession. But although one has confessed before the meal, he should confess again in the evening, and once more the next morning, and in the additional prayer, Minchah prayer, and the concluding prayer (N'ilah).

At what place in the prayer should he confess? An individual, at the end of the prayer; and the reader for the congregation, in the middle of the prayer. What shall he say? Rabh says : He shall begin : "Thou knowest the secrets of the world"; R. Samuel says, he should begin : "From the depths of the heart"; and Levi says, he shall begin : "In thy Torah it is

written thus." R. Johanan says: He should begin: "Lord of the Universe (not for our merits we pray of Thee mercy," etc.); and R. Jehudah says: He shall begin: "Our transgressions are too numerous to be counted, and our sins too mighty to be told of." R. Hamnuna says: He shall begin: "My God, before I was created I had not been worthy to be created; and now when created, I am the same as previously. I am earth during my life, and so much the more when I will be dead. I am entirely before Thee as a vessel full of disgrace and shame. May it be Thy will that I may not sin more; and my sins hitherto mayest Thou in Thy great mercy wipe off, but not by means of suffering." And this was the confession of Rabha the whole year, and that of R. Hamnuna the Younger on the Day of Atonement. Said Mar Zutra: All this has to be said, if he has not said previously, "It is true we have sinned." If, however, he has pronounced this, he need add nothing to it. As Bar Hamduri related, when he stood once before Samuel on the Day of Atonement, he perceived that as soon as the reader came to this sentence, "It is true we have sinned," all rose. Hence he understands that this is the principal part. Ulla b. Rabh was a reader in the presence of Rabha: He began the concluding prayer with: "Thou hast chosen us," etc., and concluded with, "What are we and what is our life?" etc.; and Rabha praised him. R. Huna the son of R. Nathan, however, said: When an individual reads the concluding prayer, he should say, "What are we and what is our life," etc., after it.

Rabh said: The prayer of N'ilah substitutes the evening prayer also. Rabh is in accordance with his theory elsewhere, that it is an additional prayer, and if it has been read, no other prayer is needed for the evening. Did Rabh say so? Did he not say elsewhere that the evening prayer is in general voluntary, not a duty? He means, even according to him who would say it is a duty, the "concluding prayer" substitutes it. An objection was made: We have learned in a Boraitha: In the beginning of the evening before the Day of Atonement, one shall read as prayers the seven benedictions, and confess. The same one does in the morning, and also in the additional prayer, the seven benedictions, and confessions; the same in the "concluding prayer": but in the evening one shall say as prayers seven of the eighteen week-day benedictions.* R. Hanina b.

* What the seven of the eighteen are, will be explained in Tract Berachoth.

Gamaliel said in the name of his ancestors: He shall say all the eighteen week-day benedictions, because he must include the Habdalah in the benediction of Wisdom (Honen Hadaath). The opinions of the Tana'im differ about it.

The disciples of R. Ishmael taught: He who sees Qeri on the Day of Atonement, he shall pray the whole year; but if he has survived this year, he shall be sure of entering the world to come. R. Na'hman b. Itz'hak said: The proof is when the whole world is hungry, he was full. When R. Dimi came from Palestine, he said: He will live long, he will see children and grandchildren, as it is written [Is. iii. 10]: "Shall see seed, live many days."

END OF TRACT YOMAH.

APPENDIX.

WE think it will please our readers to have placed before them the following letter, written by a Gentile who had witnessed the services at the Second Temple on the Day of Atonement. We give the entire extract as it is translated in "Shevet Jehudah" by Solomon Aben Virga, who translated it from a letter written by Versovius to King Alfonso the Pious, although it began with the Feast of Passover, part of which is already mentioned in Tract Pesachim, as it will be of much interest to the historian to know some details of the Jewish services at the Temple.

EXTRACT FROM A LETTER WRITTEN BY VERSOVIUS TO KING ALFONSO THE PIous, WHO COPIED IT FROM A WRITTEN REPORT SENT BY MARCUS, CONSUL OF JERUSALEM, TO ROME.

. . . *Tenth.*—Concerning the service at the Temple, these Jews were reluctant to inform me about it, as they declared it was against their law to inform a Gentile about the manner of their serving God. They have enlightened me upon two subjects only, part of which I saw with my own eyes, and was greatly rejoiced thereat. One was the sacrifice which they brought on the feast that they call Pessach, and is considered to be the greatest of all their feasts; and the second is the entrance of the high-priest, whom we call *sacerdote mayor*, into the Temple on the day which to them, in regard of holiness, purity, and strengthening of the soul, is the most important of all the days in the year. The Pessach sacrifice, which I have partly witnessed, as also, as I was told, the entire ceremony, takes place in the following manner. When the beginning of the month which they call Nissan approached, by the command of the king and the judges, swift messengers visited every one in the vicinity of Jerusalem who owned flocks of sheep and herds of cattle, and ordered him to hasten to Jerusalem with them, in order that the pilgrims should have sufficient animals for sacrifices and food; for the people were then very numerous, and whoever did not present himself at the appointed time, his possessions were confiscated for the benefit of the Temple. Consequently all owners of flocks and droves came hastily on, and brought them to a creek near Jerusalem, and washed and cleaned

APPENDIX.

them of all dirt. They believed that in regard of that Solomon said [Solomon's Song iv. 2]: "A flock of well-selected sheep, which are come up from the washing." When they arrived at the mountains which surround Jerusalem, the multitude was so great that the grass was not seen any longer, as everything was turned white, by reason of the white color of the wool. When the tenth day approached—as on the fourteenth day of the month the sacrifice was brought—every one went out to buy his paschal lamb. And the Jews made an ordinance, that when going forth on that mission, nobody should say to his neighbor, "Step aside," or "Let me pass," even if the one behind was King Solomon or David. When I remarked to the priests that this was not seemly nor polite, they made answer that it was so ordered, to show that there is no rank before the eyes of God, not even at the time of preparing to serve Him, more especially at the service itself; at that time all were equal in receiving His goodness. When the fourteenth day of the month arrived, they went to the highest tower of the Temple, which the Hebrews called Lul, and whose stairway was made like those in our church towers, and held three silver trumpets in their hands, with which they blew. After the blowing, they proclaimed the following: "People of the Lord, listen! The time for slaughtering the paschal lamb has arrived. In the name of Him who rests in the great and holy house!" As the people heard the proclamation, they donned their holiday attire; for since midday it was holiday for the Jews, being the time for sacrifice. At the entrance of the great hall stood twelve Levites on the outside, with silver staves in their hands; and twelve within, with gold staves in their hands. The duties of those on the outside were to direct and to warn the incoming people not to injure one another in their great haste, and not to press forward in the crowd, to prevent quarrels; as it previously happened on one of the feasts of Pessach, that an old man, together with his sacrifice, was crushed, in consequence of the great rush. Those on the inside had to preserve order among the outgoing people, that they should not crush each other. They were also to close the gates of the hall when they saw that it was already full to its capacity. When they reached the slaughtering place, rows of priests stood with gold and silver bowls in their hands: one row had all gold bowls and another row had all silver bowls. This was done to display the glory and splendor of the place. Every priest who stood at the head of the row received a bowl full of the sprinkling blood. He passed it to his neighbor, and he to his, until the altar was reached; and the priest who stood next to the altar returned the bowl empty, and it went back in the same manner, so that every priest received a full bowl and returned an empty one. And there occurred no manner of disturbance, as they were so used to the service that the bowls seemed to fly back and forth, as the arrows in the hand of a hero. For thirty days previous they practised that service, and,

therefore, found out the place where there was the possibility that a mistake or a mishap might occur. There were also two tall pillars, on which stood two priests with silver trumpets in their hands, who blew when each division began the sacrifice [the paschal lamb was slaughtered in three divisions—see Pesachim], in order to give warning to the priests who stood on their eminence to begin Hallel amid jubilee and thanksgiving, and accompanied by all their musical instruments; on that day, namely, they brought forward all the instruments. The sacrificer also prayed the Hallel. If the sacrifice was not ended, Hallel was repeated. After the sacrifice, they went into the halls, where the walls were full of iron hooks and forks; the sacrifices were hung upon them and skinned. There were also many bundles of sticks; for when there were no more empty hooks, they put a stick upon the shoulders of two of their number, hung the sacrifice upon it, skinned it, and put the particular portion upon the altar, and went away rejoicing, as one who went to the war and returned victorious. The one who did not bring the paschal lamb at the appointed time, was eternally disgraced. During the service the priests were dressed in scarlet, that the blood which might accidentally be spilled on them should not be noticed. The garment was short, reaching only to the ankle. The priests stood barefoot, and the sleeves reached only the arms, so they should not be disturbed during the service. On their heads they had a cap, around which was tied a three-ell-long band; but the high-priest, as they told me, had a band which he could tie around his cap forty times. His was white. The ovens in which they roasted the paschal lambs were before their doors, in order, as they told me, to publish their religious ceremonies, also on account of the festival joys. After the roast, they ate amid jubilee songs and thanksgiving, so that their voices were heard from afar. No gate of Jerusalem was closed during Passover night, because of those who were constantly coming and going, who were considerable in number. The Jews also told me that on the Feast of Pessach the number of those present was double of that which went out of Egypt, for they wished to acquaint the king with their number.

The second service was the entrance of the high-priest in the sanctuary. Of the service itself they did not tell me, but of the procession to and from the Temple. Some of it I have also seen with my own eyes, and it surprised me so greatly that I exclaimed: "Blessed be He who imparts His glory to His nation!" Seven days before that day which they call Atonement Day, and which is the most important in the entire year, they prepared at the house of the high-priest a place and chairs for the chief of the courts, the Nassi, the high-priest, his substitute, and for the king; and besides these, also seventy silver chairs for the seventy members of the Sanhedrin. The oldest of the priests got up and delivered an oration before the high-priest, full of earnest entreaty. He said: "Bethink thyself

before whom thou enterest, and know that if thou wilt loose the devotion of thy mind, thou wilt at once drop down dead, and the forgiveness of the Israelites will come to naught. Behold! the eyes of all Israelites are turned upon thee. Investigate thy deeds. Perchance thou hast committed some slight sin; for there are sins which equal in weight many good deeds, and only the Almighty God knows the weight thereof. Investigate also the deeds of the priests, thy brothers in office, and have them repent. Take it to heart, that thou art going to appear before the King of all kings, who sits upon the throne of judgment, who sees everything. How darest thou to appear, when thou hast the enemy within thee!" The high-priest then makes answer that he has already investigated himself, and has repented all that which seemed to him sinful; that he has also already assembled all the priests, his brother officers, in the Temple, and by Him who rests His name there conjured them that each one should confess the transgressions of his brother officers, as well as his own, and that he prescribed for each transgression a corresponding repentance. The king also spoke to him kindly, and promised to shower upon him honors, when he should safely come out of the sanctuary. After that it was publicly proclaimed that the high-priest was about to take possession of his room in the Temple. Whereupon the people made ready to accompany him, and marched before him in the following order, which I witnessed myself: First went those who traced their ancestry to the kings of Israel, then those who were nearer in the priesthood; then followed those who were of the kingly house of David, and, indeed, in the most perfect order, one after the other, and before them was exclaimed: "Give honor to the family of David!" Then followed the Levites, before whom it was exclaimed: "Give honor to the family of Levi!" Their number amounted to 36,000. At this time the substitute Levites donned blue silk garments; but the priests, 24,000 strong, donned white silk garments. Then followed the singers, the musicians, the trumpeters; then the closers of the gates, the preparers of the incense, the preparers of the holy curtains, the watchers, the masters of the treasury; and then a corps which was called *chartophylax*; then all who were employed at the Temple, then the seventy members of the Sanhedrin, then a hundred priests with silver staves in their hands to make room, then the high-priest, and behind him the older priests in pairs. At the corner of every street stood the heads of the colleges, who spoke to him thus: "High-priest, enter in peace. Pray to our Creator for our preservation, so that we may occupy ourselves with the study of His Law." When the procession reached the mount of the Temple they halted and prayed for the preservation of the kings of the house of David, then for the priests and the Temple, whereat the *Amen* exclamation, because of the great crowd, was so loud that the birds overhead fell to the ground. After that the high-priest bowed before the entire

people very respectfully, and, weeping, separated himself from them all, and two substitute priests led him into his room, where he took leave of all the priests, his brothers in office. All that took place at the procession to the Temple; but at the procession from the Temple his honor was double, for the entire population of Jerusalem marched before him, and most of them with burning candles of white wax, and all attired in white; all windows were draped with varicolored kerchiefs and were lighted dazzlingly, and, as the priests told me, the high-priest, during many years, because of the great crowds and rush, could not reach his house before midnight; for although all fasted, nevertheless they did not go home before they convinced themselves whether they could kiss the hand of the high-priest. On the following day he prepared a great feast, to which he invited his friends and relatives, and made that day a holiday, because of his safe return from the sanctuary. After that he caused a goldsmith to make a gold tablet with the following inscription engraved upon it: "I, so and so the high-priest, son of so and so the high-priest, have performed the service of the high-priest in the great and holy Temple, in the service of Him who rests His name there, in the year of creation so and so. May He who favored me with the performance of that service, favor also my son after me, to perform the service before the Lord."

TRACT HAGIGA (HOLOCAUST).

CONTENTS.

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| SYNOPSIS OF SUBJECTS OF VOLUME VI.—TRACT HAGIGA, | iii |
| CHAPTER I. | |
| REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE HOLOCAUST, AND THE AP- POINTED TIME FOR THE PEACE-OFFERING, | I |
| CHAPTER II. | |
| REGULATIONS CONCERNING PUBLIC LECTURES WHICH ARE AND WHICH ARE NOT ALLOWED, | 21 |
| CHAPTER III. | |
| REGULATIONS REGARDING IN WHAT CASES SACRED THINGS ARE MORE RIGOROUS THAN HEAVE-OFFERINGS, AND VICE VERSA, | 44 |

SYNOPSIS OF SUBJECTS.

OF

TRACT HAGIGA.

CHAPTER I.

MISHNA I. The law concerning the Holocaust, and who are exempt from it. What is the law in the case of one who is half a bondman and half free? Johanan b. Broka and R. Elazar b. Hasma have related to their master the wonderful lecture of R. Joshua, and what he rejoined. What is called a fool? The law about the lame, blind, and sick. An entire series of passages from Scripture which the different rabbis wept over when they met them in their studies, and the reason of it. What is meant by "evils and troubles," written in Deut. xxxi. 21? What will become of us with the Minim? For three things the Holy One, blessed be He, weeps every day. What happened to Rabbi and R. Hyya while on the road with the blind scholar, and his beautiful blessings. The law as to minority, and at what age a child is exempt from this condition, 1-13

MISHNAS II. to V. The law regarding the offerings which may or may not be brought from the money of the second-tithe. Peace-offerings and burnt-offerings of the pilgrims are divided according to their circumstances. The different opinions of the rabbis regarding the passage: "What is crooked cannot be made straight." The explanation of Elijah to Ben Hei Hei regarding the passage of Is. xlviii. 10. About a scholar who has separated himself from the Law. The laws about the dissolving of vows hang in the air, and which laws are suspended by a hair, and which of them are the essential parts of the Law, 13-20

CHAPTER II.

MISHNA I. Concerning the discussion of illegal unions, the creation, and the divine chariot. By ten things the world was created: by wisdom, by knowledge, etc. Which was first created, the earth or the heavens? What is meant by the term "heavens"? Woe to the creatures which see and know not what they see, which stand and know not upon what they stand. The names of the seven heavens, and what is contained therein. What an-

swer did the heavenly voice make to that wicked man when he said : "I will ascend above the heights of the clouds," etc. ? To whom the secrets of the Law may be imparted. The king among living creatures is a lion, among domestic beasts an ox, among birds an eagle, after which comes man, but the Lord takes His place proudly above them all. The thousands of troops who minister unto him. The stream of fire which is issued . . . comes from before him. Where it comes from. About the nine hundred and seventy-four generations which were held back from being created. What are the eighteen curses of Isaiah. Even at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem there did not cease from them faithful men. About the four who entered in the heavenly garden (*Pardes*). The legends of A'her concerning R. Meir his disciple when he was alive and after his death, and also what R. Johanan said and did. About what Rabba bar Shila questioned Elijah, and his answer. What R. Jehudah questioned Samuel about the world to come, and what the latter rejoined. Nimus of Gardi and R. Meir (see note). The six things regarding the demons. Every one who gazes upon three things, his eyes grow weak, 21-38

MISHNAS II. to IV. The difference of opinions concerning the princes and the chiefs of courts. About the law of laying the hand on the offers on a festival. Which is the feast in which thou makest proclamation and reapest? About the garments of a common person which are defiled by pressure for Pharisees, 38-43

CHAPTER III.

MISHNAS I. to IX. All of them treat about the details of the rigorous rules of heave-offerings, and *vice versa*. The conditions in Judah and in Galilee as to which of the inhabitants are trusted and which are not. About the salamander and the fire of Gehenna, and that the fire of Gehenna will not affect the sinners of Israel, who are full of merit as a pomegranate is full of seed, 44-54

TRACT HAGIGA (HOLOCAUST).

CHAPTER I.

REGULATIONS CONCERNING THE HOLOCAUST, AND THE APPOINTED TIME FOR THE PEACE-OFFERING.

MISHNA : All are bound in the case of a holocaust * except a deaf man, a fool, a minor, and one of doubtful sex (*ατυγρος*) and one of double sex (androginos), and women and bondsmen, the lame, the blind, the sick, the old, and he who is not able to go upon his feet. What is a minor ? Every one who is unable to ride on his father's shoulders, and to go up from Jerusalem to the mountain of the Temple. So is the decree of the School of Shammai. But the School of Hillel say : Every one who is unable to take hold of his father's hand, and to go up from Jerusalem to the mountain of the Temple, as it is said [Ex. xxiii. 14], "Three times," † etc. The School of Shammai say : The holocaust involves two silver coins (one-third of a gold dinar), and the feast-offering one meah (one-sixth of a dinar). But the School of Hillel say the contrary.

GEMARA : What is meant to be added by the word "all" ? It means to add a man who is half a slave (he was a slave to two men, and one gave him liberty). But according to Rabhina, who says that such a man is absolved from holocaust, what did the Mishna mean to add ? One who was lame on the first day, but on the second day he became well. This would be correct according to him who says that on every day of the succeeding six days the obligation of the holocaust exists, but according to those who say that all the six days are only a completion of the

* The Hebrew term is *תְּנִינָה*, which means " appearing " [vide Deut. xvi. 16], and because of the statement [ibid.], " And no one shall appear before the Lord empty," it is construed to mean the sacrifice ; i.e., the holocaust.

† The Hebrew expression for "times" is "Regalim," the singular of which is "Regel," and means "a foot" also, hence the meaning "if the minor can go with his feet."

THE BABYLONIAN TALMUD.

first day, and as he was not obliged the first day, although he was fit for it later, he is free from it. What did the Mishna mean to add by the expression "all"? Therefore we must say that it is as stated above (one who is a half-slave), and Rabhina's statement is in accordance with the later Mishna, which states as follows: For the sake of the world, it was ordained that the master of the slave shall be compelled to set him free for the purpose that he should be able to marry a free man, and the slave shall give him a note for it for the half of his value. And the School of Hillel retracted their decision and decided as the School of Shammai; consequently if he is yet half a slave, he is obliged, because he will be free, and the Mishna adds by "all" such a case.

"A deaf man, a fool, and a minor," etc. The Mishna mentions the deaf man together with fool, to teach us that as the fool has no intelligence, so also the deaf man is absolved when he has no intelligence, *i.e.*, when he is both deaf and dumb; but if he speaks but cannot hear, or *vice versa*, he is obliged. But did we not learn in a Boraitha: Both when he can hear but not speak, or speak and not hear, in either case he is free? Said Rabhina: The Boraitha is not completed, and must read thus: All are obliged in case of a holocaust, and to enjoy the festival, except a deaf man who hears but speaks not, or *vice versa*, then he is free from holocaust, but not from rejoicing. But he who neither hears nor speaks is free from rejoicing also, because he is exempt from all commandments contained in the Law. And so we also learned in a Boraitha plainly.

But why is a man who hears but speaks not, or *vice versa*, exempt from holocaust? Because about holocaust he deduces from an analogy of expression as follows: It is written [Deut. xxxi. 12]: "Assemble the people together, the men and the women, and the children," and [ibid. 2]: "When all Israel came to appear before the Lord thy God." But whence do we deduce that he who hears not but speaks, etc., is exempt from pilgrimage? Because it is written [ibid. 12]: "That they may hear, etc., that they may learn." And a Boraitha taught: "May hear" to exclude one who can talk but cannot hear, and "may learn" to exclude those who can hear but cannot speak. Is that so, that he who cannot speak cannot learn? We know there were two dumb men in the neighborhood of Rabbi, who were sons of the daughter of R. Johanan b. Gudguda (and others say, sons of his sister), who, when Rabbi entered the house of learning, went

in also, shook their heads, and muttered with their lips; and Rabbi prayed mercy for them and they were healed; and it was found that they were well versed on Halakha, and on the whole six sections of the Mishna? Said Mar Zutra: Read in the Bible: They may teach* (not "learn"), and who cannot speak cannot teach. Said R. Ashi: Assuredly, it must be so, because if learning is meant it could be deduced from the words "and they may hear," and he who cannot hear cannot learn.

R. Tan'hum said: He who is deaf in one ear is free from holocaust, because in the verse stated above [ibid. 2] it is written: "In their *ears*" (in the plural). R. Tan'hum said again: He who is lame in one foot, is also exempt, because it is written: "Three times" [Regalim (times), which means also feet (plural)].

Rabha lectured: "It is written (Song of Songs, vii. 2): "How beautiful are thy steps in sandals, O prince's daughter." This refers to the pilgrims on the festivals (see Succah, chap. iv.). R. Kahana said: R. Nathan b. Minyumi lectured in the name of R. Tan'hum: It is written [Gen. xxxvii. 24]: "And the pit was empty, there was no water in it." If it was empty, is it not self-evident that there was no water in it? Infer from this that it was empty from water, but not from snakes and scorpions.

The rabbis taught: It happened that R. Johanan b. Broka and R. Elazar b. Hasma went to visit R. Jehoshua in the city of Pekiin, and he asked them: What news is to-day in the house of learning? They answered him: We are your disciples, and we drink only your waters. He rejoined: Nevertheless, it cannot be there should not be something new in the college; tell me whose Sabbath was it for lecturing? And they said: R. Elazar b. Azariah's. And on what verse did he lecture? (asked he again). On the portion of the Assembly. And what did R. Elazar preach? He lectured thus: It is written [Deut. xxxi. 12]: "Assemble the people together, the men and the women and the children." It is right, the men came to learn, the women came to hear; for what purpose were the children brought? Only that those who brought them should be rewarded. And he rejoined: You have had a good pearl in your hand and you wanted to deprive me of it.

He also lectured on the verse Deut. xxvi. 17. (See Ber-

* The expression "Ylmdu," which means "to learn"; and Mar Zutra said it should be read "Yelamedu," which means "to teach."

choth.) The same lectured again: It is written [Eccl. xii. 2]: "The words of the wise are like goads, and like nails planted * are the words of the men of the assemblies which are given by one shepherd." As the goad keeps the animal which ploughs (to make it straight) furrows, so as to produce sustenance for the world, so also the words of the Law (keep those who study them) away from the ways of death for the ways of life. But if you would say, that as the goad is movable so also the words of Law. Therefore it is written: "Nails." But if you will say, as the nail (makes a hole in the wall and) diminishes (and does not add to it), so also the words of the Law diminish and do not add. Therefore it is written: "Planted"; as a plant is fruitful and multiplies, so also the words of the Law. "The men of assemblies," which means the scholars who sit in assembly, studying the Law and discussing—these make clean, the others make unclean, these prohibit and those allow, these make valid, those make invalid. But if one may say: If it is so, how can I learn the Torah? Therefore it is written: "Given by one shepherd." One God gave them, and one Master (Moses) said it from the mount of the Lord of all creatures, blessed be He, as it is written [Ex. xx. 1]: "And God spoke all these words." And therefore you must make your ears as an *επιχυσίς* (a kind of strainer which receives but lets not out), and gain an understanding heart to comprehend the reason why these make unclean, those clean, etc. Then R. Jehoshua rejoined: I tell you, it is not an orphan generation in the midst of which R. Elazar b. Azariah lives. Why did they not tell him at once the news in the house of learning? Because of the occurrence stated in the following Boraitha:

It happened once that R. Jose, the son of a Damascene woman, went to visit R. Eliezer in the city of Luda, and R. Elazar asked him: What news was there in the house of learning to-day? And he answered: It was voted, and the decision was that in the lands of Amman and Moab the tithe to the poor is to be given on the Sabbatical year (this is explained in Tract Maasroth), and he told him: Jose, stretch out your hand, and take out your eyes. And he did so. Then R. Elazar wept and said: It is written [Ps. xxv. 14]: "The sacred counsel of the Lord is for those that fear him, and his covenant to make it known to them." And he said to R. Jose: Go and tell

* *Netuim*, "planted" or "fastened."

them, you should not doubt about your conclusion to-day, because I have a tradition from R. Johanan b. Zakkai, who heard it from his master, and his master from *his* master, etc., up to Moses on Sinai, that the land of Amman and Moab may give the tithe to the poor on the Sabbatical year. [The reason is because those who went out of Egypt subjugated many fortified cities, but those who went out from Babylon did not, and the first sanctification had sanctified the land only for that time, but not for the future. And those who went out from Babylon left these lands for the poor; they should be supported on them on the Sabbatical year. In another Boraitha it was taught: After R. Elazar became calm he prayed that it should be the will of God that Jose's eyes be cured, and they were cured.]

The rabbis taught: What is called a fool? He who goes out alone in the night, and who sleeps in a cemetery, and who tears the clothes he wears. It was taught: R. Hunu said: It is only when he does all these things together. How is the case? If because he is a fool, then any of these is sufficient, and if he does it not through folly, what is the proof of all these? It is meant he does it through folly; but when he does all these things, he is like an ox goring another ox, a camel, and an ass, after which he is considered vicious as to all creatures, so he is considered a fool in all respects. Said R. Papa: If R. Hunu had heard the following Boraitha, which states, Who is a fool? When he destroys all things that are given to him, he would have retracted his decree.

"*One of doubtful sex*," etc. The rabbis taught: It could be written [Deut. xvi. 16]: "The males," which would exclude only the women, but it is written "*Thy* males," which means to exclude also those of doubtful as of double sex. But why is needed a verse to exclude the women? Is not this a commandment which is dependent upon the time? and it is known that of all commandments which are dependent upon the time the women are exempt. This verse is needed, for at the first glance one might say that it shall be drawn from an analogy of expression, "the assembly"; as to the assembly women are also bound, so would be the case here, therefore, it comes to teach us. The master said: "All thy males" to include the minors. But did not we learn in our Mishna, "Except a deaf man, a fool, and a minor?" Said Abayi: It presents no difficulty: There is the case of a minor who has not arrived at the age of education yet, and here is the case when he has arrived at such age. When a

minor who has arrived at such age, his duty is only rabbinical. Why then is needed a verse? Yea, it is only rabbinical, and the verse is only a support. But to what else does the verse apply? To that of the following Boraitha: Anonymous teachers said: Those whose work imparts to them a bad odor which accompanies them wherever they go, are exempt from the holocaust, because it is written, "*All thy males*," i.e., all that can go together with others, but not such as cannot be in others' company.

"*Women and bondsmen*." This is correct as to women, as it was said above, but whence do we deduce about bondsmen? Said R. Huna: Because it is written there [ibid. ibid.]: "Before the Lord thy God," which means one who has only one Lord, but not such as has another lord. Let us see: To what purpose is needed a separate verse? It is known that all the commandments which are obligatory to a woman are so also to a bondsman and all the commandments from which a woman is exempt a bondsman is also exempt, and this is inferred from an analogy of expressions [Deut. xxiv. 1]: "Write her," and [Lev. xix. 20] "Her freedom given her," hence a woman and bondsman are equal in duties. Said Rabhina: The verse is needed for one who is half a slave and half free, and it seems to be so because the Mishna taught: Women and bondsmen who were not freed. To what purpose is stated "not freed"? If it is meant that they were not freed at all, "bondsmen" alone is enough. We must say, therefore, that the Mishna meant those who were not wholly free. And what can that be? One who is half a slave and half free.

"*The lame, blind, sick*," etc. The rabbis taught: It is written "Regalim" to exclude the lame, sick, blind, and old men who cannot go with their feet. What is meant to be added by "who cannot go with their feet"? Said Rabha: Such delicate persons as cannot walk without shoes (and in the Temple it was not permitted to go in shoes), as it is written [Is. i. 12]: "When you come to appear in my presence, who had required this at your hand to tread down my courts?"

We have learned in a Boraitha: If one is uncircumcised, or unclean, he is exempt from the holocaust. It is right of one unclean, because it is written [Deut. xii. 5, 6]: "And thither shalt thou come, and ye shall bring thither." From this we infer, that he who can come in ought to bring, but he who cannot, should not; (and he who is unclean cannot come into the Tem-

ple). But of an uncircumcised, wherefrom is it deduced? This is in accordance with R. Aqiba, who makes an uncircumcised equal to an unclean one, as we have learned in the following Boraitha: R. Aqiba said: It is written [Lev. xxii. 4]: "Any man whatsoever of the seed of Aaron." "Any man"—it could be written "a man." Why "any man," to include that "the uncircumcised shall be equal to the unclean ones"?

The rabbis taught: R. Johanan b. Dahabai said in the name of R. Jehudah: A man blind in one eye is exempt from the holocaust, because it is written [Deut. xvi. 16]: "Shall appear,"* as if one comes to see, it is with both eyes; so if he appears, he must be with both eyes. R. Huna, when he came to the verse above cited, used to weep and say: That a slave whose master exhorts him to come to see him should be debarred from seeing him, as it is written [Is. i. 12]: "When you come to appear in my presence, who had required this at your hands to tread my courts?" Also when he came to the following verse [Deut. xxvii. 7]: "And thou shalt slay peace-offerings, and eat there." A slave who is invited to eat from his master's table, shall be debarred from seeing him, as it is written [Is. i. 1]: "Or what serveth me the multitude of your sacrifices?" R. Elazar, when he came to this verse [Gen. xlvi. 3]: "And his brothers could not answer him, because they were terrified at his presence," he wept and said: If one is thus terrified when a human being has recognized his guilt, how much the more will it be before the Holy One, blessed be He.

Also when he came to the verse [1 Sam. xxviii. 15]: "And Samuel said to Saul: Why hast thou disquieted me, to bring me up?" If Samuel, the upright, was afraid of the judgment, so much the more must we be afraid of it. How shall this be understood? It is written [ibid. 12]: "And the woman said unto Saul: Divine beings have I seen ascending (Olim) out of the earth." Olim is plural. (Who were they?) It was Samuel and Moses, because Samuel was afraid. Perhaps he was asked to the judgment, and he had gone to Moses and asked him to testify, that he (Samuel) had done all that was written in his Law. R. Ammi, when he came to the following verse, used to cry [Lam. iii. 29]: "That he put his mouth in the dust, perhaps there still is hope." He said: After so much had been done,

* The Hebrew expression is פָּנָה, which means "shall be seen"; the same letters with following punctuation פָּנָה! would be "shall see," hence the analogy.

nevertheless it is said "*perhaps*." Also when he came to the following verse [Zeph. ii. 3]: "Seek righteousness, seek meekness, perhaps ye will be protected," he said: After so much will have been done, still it will be "*perhaps*." R. Asi, when he came to the following passage, used to cry [Amos v. 15]: "Hate the evil and love the good, and establish justice firmly in the gate: perhaps the Lord, the God of hosts." He said: After so much will have been done, it will still be "*perhaps*."

R. Joseph, when he came to the verse [Prov. xiii. 23]: "But there are many who are taken away without justice," * cried. R. Johanan, when he came to the following passage [Job ii. 3]: "And thou hast incited him against me to destroy him without cause," he cried. He said: If a slave persuades his master, and the master is persuaded, what cure can there be? Also, when he came to the following passage [ibid. xv. 15]: "In his holy one he putteth no trust," he cried and said: If he puts no trust in his holy one, whom will he believe? Once when on the road he saw a man pick figs from a tree. He left the ripe ones and picked the unripe ones. R. Johanan asked him: Are not the ripe ones better? He answered: These which are unripe I need for the route, because the ripe ones will be spoilt, but not these. Then said R. Johanan: This is as what is written: He putteth no trust in his holy ones (*i.e.*, they are gathered in before they are tempted to sin).

R. Johanan, when he came to the following verse [Mal. iii. 5] he wept: "And I will come near unto you to hold judgment, and I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers, and against the adulterers, and against those that swear falsely, and against those that withhold the wages of the hired laborer, fear me not, saith the Lord of hosts."

R. Johanan b. Zakkai said: Woe is to us, the verse makes equal for us light sins as well as grave sins." (Rashi explains it that the light sin is that of those who withhold the wages of the hired laborer, who is here equal to sorcerers, etc.) R. Hanina bar Papa said: When a man commits a sin and soon repents of it, he is forgiven immediately, because it is written [ibid.]: "And fear me not, saith the Lord of hosts." When he fears and asks for forgiveness, he is pardoned. R. Johanan, when he came to the verse [Eccl. xii. 14]: "For every deed will God bring into the

* Here is a legend of what happened to R. Bibi bar Abayi with the Angel of Death, who killed a man prematurely, which is omitted according to our method. This, however, can be found in the translation of Mr. Streane.

judgment, concerning everything that had been hidden," he cried. He said: If there is a slave whose master reckons his unintentional sins as his intentional sins, what cure can there be? What is meant by "everything that hath been hidden"? Said Rabh: When one kills a louse in another man's presence, and makes himself disagreeable thereby to him. And Samuel says: Even if he spits in the presence of his neighbor, and makes himself disagreeable.

What is meant [ibid.], "Whether it be good, or whether it be bad"? The disciples of R. Janai said: That applies to a man who gives charity to a poor man publicly. As R. Janai saw a man give a Zuz to a poor man publicly, he said to him: It would be better if you gave him not at all than as you did now, and put him to shame. The disciples of R. Shila said: It means a man who gives charity to a woman secretly, which brings on him suspicion.

It is written [Deut. xxxi. 21]: "And it shall come to pass when many evils and troubles." What is meant by "evils and troubles"? Said Rabh: Evils that trouble one another; for instance, a man who was bitten by a bee and by a scorpion—for the bee's sting warm water is needed, and for a scorpion's bite cold water is needed, hence the use of either will harm the other wound. Samuel said: What is written before, "whether good or bad," means one who (whether he is in good or bad circumstances) gives money to the poor only when the latter is in extreme poverty. Said Rabha: This is what people say: A Zuz for pleasure is not to be obtained, but a Zuz for trouble must be found (at any time).

It is written [Deut. xxxi. 17]: "And my anger shall be kindled against them on that day, and I will forsake them, and I will hide my face from them, and they shall be given to be devoured." Said R. Bardala bar Tebiumi in the name of Rabh: A man from whom God hides not his face is not an Israelite, and he who is not given to be devoured is not an Israelite, either. Said the rabbis to Rabha: It seems to us that you are neither included in the "hiding of the face" nor in the "devouring." And he rejoined: Can you know how much I must spend secretly on the government? Nevertheless the rabbis looked at him with an evil eye, and finally they came from the government and robbed him of everything. Said he: This is what R. Simeon b. Gamaliel said: Whatever the sages looked at with their eyes, either death or poverty followed.

It is written [ibid.]: "And I will hide my face from them." Said Rabha: The Holy One, blessed be He, said: "Although I have hidden my face from them, nevertheless I will talk to them in the dream." R. Joseph said: Still His hand is inclined to us, as it is written [Is. li. 16]: "With the shadow of my hand have I covered thee."

R. Joshua b. Hanania was before the Emperor (Cæsar). A Min who stood by showed him with his hand a people from whom God had turned away His face. R. Joshua b. Hanania showed *him* with *his* hand that "His hand is still over us." Asked the Emperor of R. Joshua: Do you know what the Min has shown you with his hand? He replied: Yes, he showed me a people from whom God had turned away His face. He asked him: What have *you* shown *him* with *your* hand? He answered: I showed him that God's hand is still inclined over us. The Emperor then asked the Min: What have you shown to R. Joshua b. Hanania? He said the same. And he asked him: What did he show you? He replied: I do not know. Then the Emperor said: A man that does not know what is shown to him by a sign, should he dare to raise his hand in the presence of an emperor? He ordered, and the Min was killed.

When R. Joshua b. Hanania was dying, the rabbis asked him: What will become of us with the Minim? He rejoined: It is written [Jer. xlix. 7]: "Is counsel vanished from the sons, is their wisdom become corrupt?" And this must be interpreted: When the children of God love their adviser the wisdom of their adversaries becomes corrupt. [And if you wish, we can infer it from the following passage (Gen. xxxiii. 12): "Let us depart and move farther, and I will travel near* thee," which means we will be always equal to those against us.]

R. Ula, when ascending the steps of the house of Rabba bar Shila, heard a child read the following passage [Amos iv. 13]: "He that formeth the mountains, and createth the wind and declareth unto man what is his thought." And he said: If there is a slave whose master can declare him what his secret thought is, what cure can there be? What is meant by "He declareth"? Said Rabh: Even a superfluous conversation between a man and his own wife is mentioned to him at the time of his death.

It is written [Jer. xiii. 17]: "My eye shall weep sorely and run down with tears, because the flock of the Lord is driven

* *Lnegdecho* and *Neged* mean "against."

away captive." Said R. Elazar: What signify the three tears?* One over the first, one over the second Temple, and one over the exile of Israel from their land.

The rabbis taught: For the following three things the Holy One, blessed be He, weeps every day: For him who has the power to study the Law every day and does not; for him whose circumstances do not allow him to study, but who nevertheless does, and for a chief of the congregation who is haughty toward his congregation. Rabbi held the book of Lamentations and read. When he came to the verse [Lam. ii. 2]: "He had cast down from heaven unto the earth," the book dropped out of his hand. He said: It fell from the highest attic to the lowest pit.

Rabbi and R. Hyyya were on the road. When they came to a city they said: If here is a scholar we will go to pay him a visit. They were told: There is here a young scholar, but he is blind. Said R. Hyyya to Rabbi: You, as a Nasi, stay here, not to degrade your dignity, and I will go to see him. Rabbi did not listen, but perforce accompanied him. The blind man said to them when they were departing: You have come to see a countenance that can be seen, but cannot see; therefore ye should deserve to see that countenance which sees all, but which no one sees. Said Rabbi (to R. Hyyya): If I had listened to you, and refrained to accompany you, I could not have received this blessing. They then asked the blind man: From whom have you heard this beautiful saying? (That to visit a scholar is so great a merit.) He replied: I heard it at the lecture of R. Jacob of the village of Hitaya, who used to visit his master every day. When he became old, his master said to him: Do not take this trouble now, for you are too aged to walk every day. He answered: Is this slight in your estimation what is written about scholars [Ps. xlix. 10]: "Should he still live forever, and not see the pit, for he must see that wise men die"? Now, if he who sees the wise die lives forever, much more so he who comes to see them when alive.

R. Idi, the father of R. Jacob bar Idi, had the custom to be three months on the road, and one day in college. The students of the college called him "the single-day student." So he became discouraged, and said in application to himself the verse [Job xii. 4]: "I am as one laughed at by his friends." Said R.

* In this verse in the Hebrew "tears" is mentioned three times.

Johanan to him: "I pray thee, do not cause the rabbis to be punished (by Heaven for their wrong to him), and he himself went and lectured thus: It is written [Is. lviii. 2]: "Yet me do they ever seek day by day, and to know my ways do they always desire," and said: Do they seek only by day, and not in the night? This comes to teach us that he who studies the Law even one day in the year, the verse makes him equal to one who studied the whole year.

"*Every one unable to ride on his father's shoulders,*" etc. R. Zera was opposed to this teaching, and asked: And who brought him as far as Jerusalem? Abayi answered: As his mother is bound to rejoice, she brought him, and there if he can go up to the Temple mountain with his father, he is no longer a minor. To defend the teaching of the School of Hillel, Rabbi replied thus: It is written in 1 Sam. i. 22: Hannah said: "So soon as the child shall be weaned, I will bring him." Why did she let him wait till he would be weaned, since the father could have carried him? Said Abayi* to him: According to your question, why did Hannah herself fail to go, since she was bound to rejoice? It must be said, that because of the too delicate condition of the child (which his mother noticed in him) she did not want to go.

"*Beth Shammai say two silver coins,*" etc. The rabbis taught: Beth Shammai say two silver coins for holocaust, because the sacrifice is a burnt-offering and must be more valuable, but for the feast-offering, which is only a peace-offering, one meah suffices. And we find also in case of Pentecost, about which the Law commands the burnt-offering should cost more than the peace-offering. And the Beth Hillel say: For the holocaust only one silver coin is sufficient. But the feast-offering had existed before the Law was given to Moses, as it is written [Ex. xxiv. 5]: "And they offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings." (Although in the Bible it is written after the Law was given, this occurred before.) And we also find when the princes of Israel offered sacrifices, the cost of the peace-offerings was greater than the burnt-offerings.

Abayi said: Beth Shammai (R. Elazar and R. Ishmael) all hold that the sacrifice the Israelites offered in the desert was a holocaust-offering, and the Beth Hillel (R. Aqiba and R. Jose the Galilean) all hold that it was the daily offering, but not that of holocaust. We have learned in Tract Peah, Chap. I., the fol-

* This must be Abayi the Elder, who lived at that time.

lowing things have no biblical prescribed quantity: Peah (the corner); the first-fruit [Deut. xxvi.], and the holocaust-offering, and the conferring of kindness and the studying of the Law. R. Johanan taught to say: They have no prescribed maximum, but they have a prescribed minimum, until R. Oshia the Great came and taught: The holocaust has no prescribed quantity, even a minimum. But the sages said: The holocaust-offering should not be of less worth than a silver coin, and the feast-offering not less than two.

The expression in the above-cited Mishna for the holocaust is "the seeing" (Haraion). Now the question arises what is meant by "the seeing"? R. Johanan said: He can come to the court as many times as he likes to see it; the sacrifice, however, is only once in each festival. Resh Lakish, however, said: Every time he comes to visit the court he must offer a sacrifice. And they differ only during the whole year, not in the festivals. According to R. Johanan he may visit it without a sacrifice, but according to Resh Lakish he must bring a sacrifice, but both agree, in the festivals, he must come with a sacrifice, and one is sufficient for all days of the feast. And Resh Lakish agrees also that when one comes to visit in the middle of the year without a sacrifice, he may nevertheless enter the court and the Temple, but they differ when he came in the middle of the year and brought a sacrifice with him. According to R. Johanan it must not be accepted from him as an offering of the holocaust, because it is not prescribed how many times he should visit, but is prescribed that only one sacrifice in each festival. And according to Resh Lakish it may be accepted, because there is no prescribed quantity for sacrifices also, and he can sacrifice as much as he likes.

We have learned in a Boraitha: It is written [Prov. xxv. 17]: "Make thy foot scarce to the house of thy friend." From this we may infer: Thou shalt forbear to bring too many sin-offerings. Whence do we deduce this? Perhaps it means too many burnt-offerings or peace-offerings? It cannot be, for it is written [Ps. lxvi. 13]: "I will enter thy house with burnt-offerings; I will pay unto thee my vows (peace-offerings)." Now we see that burnt-offerings and peace-offerings he can offer when he likes. What, then, does the verse mean? Sin-offerings.

MISHNA: Burnt-offerings on the intermediate days come from ordinary things, but the peace-offerings from second-tithe. On the first day of Passover the School of Shammai say that

they come from ordinary things, but the School of Hillel say that they come from the second-tithe. Israelites generally fulfil their duty with vows and voluntary offerings, and with cattle-tithe, and the priests by the eating of sin-offering and of the trespass-offering, and by the first-born, and by the breast which hath been waved, and the shoulder which hath been lifted up; but not by eating of birds or of meal-offerings.

GEMARA : According to this Mishna, burnt-offerings are only to be sacrificed on the intermediate days, but not on the festival itself, and this would not be according to the School of Hillel concerning the Mishna in the next chapter? The Mishna is not completed, but must read thus: Burnt, vow, and voluntary offerings can be brought only on the intermediate days, not on the festival itself. The holocaust-offering, however, may be brought even on the festival. And when it is brought it must be only from ordinary things, but the peace-offerings of enjoying may be brought also from the second-tithe; the feast-offering, however, on the first day of Passover, the School of Shammai say, from ordinary things, and the School of Hillel say, from second-tithe. And so it was taught plainly in a Boraitha. Why is the feast-offering on the first day of the Passover different? Said R. Ashi: The Mishna comes to teach us only the feast-offering of the fifteenth of Nisan may be brought on the festival, but not of the fourteenth (which is brought together with the Paschal lamb). [From this we see that R. Ashi holds that the feast-offering of the fourteenth is not biblical.]

The Mishna says: The School of Hillel say: It may be brought from the second-tithe. Why? Is this not a duty-offering, and all that is a duty-offering must come from ordinary things? Said Ula: They meant to say, when he added the money of the second-tithe to the ordinary money. Hezkyah, however, said: An animal from second-tithe can be added to an ordinary animal, but with money it cannot be done so. R. Johanan, however, said: That, on the contrary, money to money can be added, but an animal to an animal cannot be added.

We have learned in one Boraitha in accordance with Hezkyah, another in accordance with R. Johanan.

"*Israelites fulfil their duty,*" etc. The rabbis taught: It is written [Deut. xvi. 14]: "Thou shalt rejoice on thy feast," that is to add, all the moneys you have for rejoicing you can add to the money for this rejoicing. (It is said in another place that there is no rejoicing without meat, and as he has money

for the second-tithe as for other rejoicing, he can use it to eat the meat of the peace-offerings.) From this the sages infer that the Israelites can fulfil their duty with vow and voluntary offerings and with cattle-tithe; and the priest with sin and trespass-offerings, with the firstlings, and wave (breast) and heave (shoulder), lest one say, also with birds or meal-offerings. It is therefore written: "Thou shalt rejoice *thy* feast," and from this we may infer that all the things of which a feast-offering may be brought can be used for enjoying, excluding the above, of which a feast-offering cannot be brought. And R. Ashi said: From the expression only "Thou shalt *rejoice*" it can be inferred, because meal and fowls are not used for rejoicing.

MISHNA: He who has many to eat with him and few possessions brings more peace-offerings and fewer burnt-offerings. He who has more possessions than persons to eat with him brings more burnt-offerings and fewer peace-offerings. If one has little of both, to this case applies the saying about the meah of silver and the two pieces of silver. If he have enough of both, to this case applies the words: "Every man shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the Lord thy God, which he hath given you" [Deut. xvi. 17].

GEMARA: More peace-offerings? Where should he take them? Said R. Hisda: He should add money, and shall bring a large bull. Ula said in the name of Resh Lakish: If one have separated ten animals for his feast-offerings, if he have offered five on the first festival, he may offer the other five on the second day of the festival. R. Johanan, however, said: As soon as he stopped offering, he shall not do it more. Said R. Abba: They do not differ, however. R. Johanan says he must do so, when he stopped, without any condition, but Resh Lakish meant the case when he said, when he stopped, that he would offer more. So it was taught also, that R. Shaman bar Abba said in the name of R. Johanan: The case where he cannot continue his offerings is only when he has no time to continue this day, and did not do so, but when he had time he may continue on the morrow.

MISHNA: If one has not offered the feast-offering on the first day of the festival, he may do it on any of the seven intermediate days, and even on the last day of the festival; but if the feast is over and he has not done it, he is not responsible for this. Of such a person is said [Eccl. i. 15]: "That what is crooked cannot be made straight, and what is defective cannot

be numbered." R. Simeon b. Manassea, however, said: Who is this that is crooked that cannot be made straight? That is he who forms an illegitimate connection and begets therefrom a bastard child. If you should say: Nay, it has to do with theft and plunder, then he could make restitution of it and be made straight? R. Simeon b. Jo'hai said: Nothing is called crooked that was not straight at the beginning and has become crooked. And what is this? A scholar that separates himself from the Law.

GEMARA: Whence do we deduce this? Said R. Johanan in the name of R. Ishmael: It is written of the seven days of Passover: "Assembly," and it is also written of the eighth day of the Feast of Tabernacles: "Assembly." As the eighth day of the Feast of Tabernacles is a completion, so also is the seventh day of Passover, and this expression is "empty" (seemingly superfluous), because if it would not be superfluous it could be objected to that the seventh day of Passover is not separated in anything from the former days, but the eighth day of the Feast of Tabernacles is separated from the former days in the offerings and in many things (as is stated in *Succah*). And in reality this expression "assembly" is superfluous: for let us see: What is meant by "assembly to the Lord thy God"? They shall assemble not to do any labor, and this is already written above [Deut. xvi. 8]: "You shall not do any labor." Why "assembly" again? Infer from this to make it "empty" for the analogy stated above. But the Tana of the Boraitha infers this from the following passage: It is written [Lev. xxiii. 41]: "Ye shall celebrate it as a feast unto the Lord seven days in the year." Might we assume he shall celebrate the holidays all the seven days? Therefore it is written "it"—*it* but not *all* the seven days. And for what purpose then is it written "seven days"? You must say, they are only for a completion. But whence do you know that if he has not offered the feast-offering on the first day, he may do so on all the succeeding six days of the festivals? Therefore it is written [*ibid.*]: "In the seventh month shall ye celebrate." If the seventh month, one might assume that he shall celebrate the whole month? Therefore it is written "it" (on the festival), but ye cannot do so outside of the festival.

"*If the feast is over,*" etc. Said Ben Hei Hei to Hillel: If it is so, why is it written, "Cannot be numbered"? It should be written, "Fulfilled"? We must therefore say that this verse means,

that if a man was numbered among his colleagues for a religious duty, and he did not want to be numbered—of him is said the verse. So also we have learned plainly in a Boraitha (Berachoth). Ben Hei Hei again asked Hillel: It is written [Mal. iii. 18]: “And ye shall return and see the difference between the righteous and the wicked, between him that serveth God and him that has not served him.” What is the difference between the righteous and the servant of God, or the wicked and him who serves not God? Is it not the same? And he answered: Both he who serves God and serves not are really upright men, but when one repeats his chapter of the Law one hundred times he is not equal to him who does it one hundred and one times. Said Ben Hei Hei again: Can the man be called upright who serves not God, because he did not repeat the one hundredth and first time? And he said: Yea, go and learn from the market-place, where asses are hired: when one hires an ass for ten parsa, he pays one Zuz, but if for eleven, he must pay two.

Elijah said to Ben Hei Hei, according to others to R. Elazar: It is written [Is. xlvi. 10]: “Behold, I have refined thee, though not into silver: I have approved thee in the crucible of affliction.”* Infer from this when the Holy One, blessed be He, looked for merits given to Israel, he found only poverty. Said Samuel, and according to others R. Joseph: This is what people say: Poverty becomes Israel as a red leather trapping a white horse.

“R. Simeon b. Menassea,” etc. If born, yea, but if not, nay? Did we not learn in a Boraitha: Simeon b. Manassea said: If one has stolen something, he can return it and repair his sin; if one has robbed, he can return, and make all good, but he who has had a connection with his neighbor’s wife, and disqualified her for his neighbor, this man is destroyed from the world, and is lost? R. Simeon b. Jo’hai said: We do not say, one shall examine a camel, or one shall examine a pig (because they are unfit, and there is nothing to examine). But what is to be examined? A sheep (which is fit for an offering). Perhaps it has received a blemish which makes it unfit—that is, a scholar who has departed from the Law. R. Jehudah b. Lakish said: Of a scholar who separated himself from the Law the verse [Prov. xxvii. 8] said: “As a bird that wandereth away from her nest, so is a man that wandereth away from his place.” Of him is also

* *Oni* is translated “affliction,” but by the Talmud “poverty.”

written [Jer. ii. 5]: "What fault did your fathers find in me, that they went away from me?" (Now we see, however, that he who has a connection with his neighbor's wife, although he has no bastard born, is also destroyed from the world? It presents no difficulty: If he forced her, she may continue with her husband and he may repent and make it good, but if a bastard was born, she cannot live with her husband, and he is lost; but if he did it with her will, even when there is no bastard, he is lost). And if you wish I will say: In both cases it is when he used force. If he had a connection with the wife of a priest (who cannot live with her husband in any case), he is lost even when no bastard was born; and when it is stated that he is lost only when a bastard is born, the wife of a common man is meant.

It is written [Zech. viii. 10]: "And for him that went out or came in there was no peace." Said Rabh: That means, if a man goes out from the study of the Mishna to read the verses of the Bible, this man can have no more peace (because nothing can be decided from the verses without the commentary of the Mishna). Samuel, however, said: Even the man who separates himself from the Talmud to learn the Mishna (because nothing can be decided from the Mishna without the explanation of the Talmud). R. Johanan said: Even he who separates himself from the Palestinian Talmud, and goes to the Babylonian Talmud, (because nothing is to be decided from the Babylonian Talmud, as it is said in Sanhedrin: "In dark places that he set me to dwell," etc. [Lam. iii. 6], which means, the Babylonian Talmud); and so explains Rashi; but Tosphath says, it can be explained *vice versa*, i.e., one who goes from the Babylonian Talmud before understanding it thoroughly to the Palestinian Talmud, who will surely not understand it.

MISHNA: The laws about the dissolving of vows hang in the air, and have no basis (in the Bible). The Halakhath concerning Sabbath, feast-offerings, and trespasses are as mountains suspended by a hair, because the verses of the Bible concerning this are very few, and the Halakhath are very many. The jurisprudence, the Temple services, and the purification, and uncleanness, and the cases of illegal unions, have a basis in the Bible, and they are the essential parts of the Law.

GEMARA: We have learned in a Boraitha: R. Elazar, however, said: They have a basis in the Bible, as it is written: [Lev. xxvii. 2]: "If a man make a particular vow," and [Num.

vi. 2] it is written again: "Pronounce an especial vow." Why twice? It is to signify—one is to make the vow, the other is to dissolve it. R. Joshua said also: They have a basis, as it is written: [Ps. xcv. 11]: "So that I swore in my wrath." From this we infer, what I have sworn in my wrath, which later I recalled (and from this we infer, who swears, or vows when he is excited, or so, may later ask to have it dissolved). R. Itz'hak said: There is a basis from the following [Ex. xxxv. 5]: "Whosoever is of a willing heart." From this we may infer, he can make a vow with a willing heart, but otherwise he can ask for its being dissolved. Hananiah the son of R. Jehoshuah's brother said: Their basis is the following verse [Ps. cxix. 106]: "I have sworn and I will perform it, to observe thy righteous ordinances," and when he says, "I will perform it," he may sometimes not do it, although he has sworn, because he will ask it to be dissolved. Said R. Jehudah in the name of Samuel: If I would be there I would say to them: The following verse would be better than yours, viz. [Num. xxx. 3]: "He shall not profane his word." He shall not profane, but others can make him profane it. Said Rabha: To all said above I can object, but what Samuel said could not be objected to.

"*The Halakhath concerning Sabbath.*" Are not written many verses about Sabbath? Why do they say, they are as mountains suspended by a hair? It is prohibited only to labor with an intention, but what is and what is not labor with an intention is not written at all; but the Talmud concludes that it is such that was done in the Tabernacle, because the commandment of Sabbath immediately precedes the building of the Tabernacle [Ex. xxv.].

"*The offering of peace.*" Why, it is written? (It is said above, "Ye shall celebrate"? Yea, it is written, "Ye shall celebrate it," but where is it written an offering shall be brought?) This may be inferred from an analogy of expressions. It is written [Ex. v. 1]: "That they may hold a feast unto me in the wilderness," and it is written [Amos v. 25]: "Have ye offered unto me sacrifices and meat-offerings in the wilderness?" Hence as there is plainly stated "offerings," so also "hold a feast" means to bring offerings. Why, then, is it said, they are as mountains hanging by a hair? Because between the words of the law of the Pentateuch and the words of the Prophets we do not draw any analogies.

"*Trespass.*" Is that not written? Said Rabha: It means as

a case of the following Boraitha: If the owner has remembered, but his messenger did not remember, the messenger has trespassed. Now, what has the poor messenger done to trespass? That is, these laws are as mountains hanging by a hair.

"*In the Bible are very few,*" etc. We have learned in a Boraitha: That about plagues, tents for a dead body, the verses are few, and the Halakhath are many. Is that so? Of plagues there are very many verses? Said R. Papa: The Boraitha meant to say thus: About plagues there are many verses, but few Halakhath; but about tents there are few verses, but many Halakhath. And what is the difference? That is, if one is doubtful in a Halakha concerning plagues, he should look up the Bible, but if he is doubtful concerning tents, he must look up the Mishnas.

"*Jurisprudence.*" (The Mishna says, it has only a basis. Is it only that?) Is it not written all about it? It is meant a case as in the following Boraitha: Rabbi said: What is written [Ex. xxi. 23]: "Life for life" means money. But whence do we deduce this? Perhaps it means life in the reality? Therefore here it is written: "Thou shalt give," and in the preceding verse it is written: "He shall give by the decision of the judges." As there it is to pay money only, so it is here.

"*The Temple services.*" Is this not written? It means to say about the bringing of the blood to the altar, as we have learned in a Boraitha. The passage [Lev. iv.] "shall bring" means "*receiving*" the blood, as it is a service that must be done by the priest with the observation of all the regulations of the Law.

"*Clean and unclean.*" Is this not written? The Mishna means, the prescribed quantity for a legal bath, which is not written at all. But about unclean things, is it not written? It means to say, the size of a lentil from a reptile defiles, which is not written.

"*Illegal unions.*" Is it not written about this plainly? It was necessary to meet the case of the daughter of a woman whom he has forced, which is not written about in the Bible and that is only drawn from an analogy of expression.

"*And they are the essentials of the Law.*" Are only these the essential parts? and the former not? Say, they are also.

CHAPTER II.

REGULATIONS CONCERNING PUBLIC LECTURES WHICH ARE AND WHICH ARE NOT ALLOWED.

MISHNA: One should not discuss illegal unions unless there were three besides him, nor the creation unless there were two besides him, nor the divine chariot with one individual, unless he was a wise man and had much knowledge of his own. Every one who tries to know the following four things, it were better for him if he had never come into the world, viz.: What is above and what is beneath, what was before creation, and what will be after all will be destroyed. And every one who does not revere the glory of his Creator, it were better for him he had not come into the world.

GEMARA: In the first part it is said: "The divine chariot with an individual" (because he may deviate from the tradition and add out of his own mind, and there will be nobody to remind him), and afterwards it is said: "Unless he is a wise man and will understand by himself?" (from this we infer, that no tradition is necessary). The Mishna meant to say thus: One must not lecture about illegal unions even to three, nor about the creation even to two, and not about the divine chariot even to one, unless the lecturer was a wise man and will understand himself to answer, if they will question him about something. Why so? Said R. Ashi: One must not lecture about illegal unions not mentioned in the Bible (*e.g.*, his daughter of a forced woman, or the mother of his father-in-law, which is drawn only from an analogy of expression?) And why not to three? This is common sense. If there are only two, the Master speaks to one, and the other listens to him. But if there are three, one listens, and the other two discuss it between them, and can err and come to a wrong conclusion to permit an unlawful thing. If it is so, why only about unlawful unions, the case should be the same with the whole Law? In case of unlawful unions it is different, because the Master says: Robbing and vice a man desires. If so, why only in case of illegal unions, let him not lecture about robbery

also to three? Robbery one desires when the thing to be robbed is in his presence, but this is desired in the party's absence also.

"And not about creation to two." Whence do we deduce this? As stated in the following Boraitha: It is written [Deut. iv. 32]: "For do but ask of former days" (this is in the singular). From this we may infer, that *one* may ask, not *two*. Lest one assume that a man can ask, What was before the creation? therefore it is written [ibid.]: "Since the day that God created man from the earth"; but lest one assume, a man must not ask even what was done in the six days of creation? therefore it is written [ibid.]: "Which were before thee" [*i.e.*, the six days before]; lest one ask, What is above and what is beneath, what was before creation and what will be after it? therefore it is written [ibid.]: "From one end of the heavens unto the other end of the heavens," "but not what is beyond." [If we infer this from what is written: "From one end of the heavens unto the other end," why is needed the verse further: "Since the day that God created man upon the earth"? This is according to R. Elazar, who said that Adam was tall from the earth up to heaven, and after he had transgressed, the Holy One, blessed be He, laid His hand upon him, and made him lower, as it is written (Ps. cxxxix. 5): "Behind and before hast thou hedged me in, and thou placest upon me thy hand."]

R. Jehudah in the name of Rabh said: Ten things were created on the first day, and they are: heaven and earth; chaos and desolation; light and darkness; wind and waters; the measures of the day and those of the night—heaven and earth, for it is written [Gen. i. 1]: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth"; chaos and desolation, for it is written [ibid. i. 2]: "And the earth was without form and void (chaos)"; light and darkness—darkness, for it is written [ibid., ibid.]: "And darkness was upon the face of the deep"; light, for it is written [ibid. i. 3]: "And God said, Let there be light"; wind and water, for it is written [ibid. i. 2]: "And the spirit (wind) of God was waving over the face of the waters"; the measures of the day and those of the night, for it is written [ibid. i. 5]: "And it was evening, and it was morning, the first day."

We have learned in a Boraitha: Chaos is a green line compassing all the world, and from it darkness springs, as it is written [Ps. xviii. 12]: "He made darkness his hiding place, round about him." Desolation—this means the stones covered

with mud, which are sunk in the deep, from which waters come forth, as it is written [Is. xxxiv. 11]: "And he shall stretch out over it the line of destination and the weights of desolation."

Was light created on the first day? Is it not written [Gen. i. 17]: "And God set them in the expansion of the heaven," and also [ibid. i. 19]: "And it was evening and it was morning the fourth day"? This is as R. Elazar said: The light which the Holy One created on the first day, Adam saw by its means from one end of the world to the other. When the Holy One considered the generation of the flood and the generation of the dispersion, and that their works were vain, He took it from them and concealed it for the upright in the world to come. In this, however, the following Tanaim differ, as we have learned in a Boraitha: The light which the Holy One, blessed be He, created on the first day, Adam observed and saw by its means from one end of the world to the other. So said R. Jacob. But the sages said: These are the luminaries which were created on the first day, but were not hung up until the fourth day.

R. Zutra bar Tobiah in the name of Rabh said: By ten things the world was created: by wisdom and by understanding; by knowledge and by strength; by rebuke and by might; by righteousness and by judgment; by mercy and by compassion.* R. Jehudah in the name of Rabh said: At the time that the Holy One, blessed be He, created the world it went spreading on like two clews of shoot and warp, until the Holy One, blessed be He, rebuked it and brought it to a standstill, as it is written [Job xxvi. 11]: "The pillars of heaven tremble greatly, and are astounded at his rebuke." And this is what Resh Lakish also said: What is meant by [Gen. xvii. 1]: "I am the Almighty God"? (*אֵל*). It means: I am He *Who* (*וָה*) said to the world, "*Enough*" (*סָבִר*). Resh Lakish said again: At the time the Holy One, blessed be He, created the sea, it went spreading on, until the Holy One, blessed be He, rebuked it and made it dry, for it is written [Nah. i. 4]: "He rebuketh the sea and maketh it dry; and all the rivers he dried up."

The rabbis taught: The School of Shammai say: The heavens were created in the beginning, and afterwards the earth was created, for it is written [Gen. i. 1]: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." But the School of Hillel say: The earth was created in the beginning, and afterwards the

* All these are deduced from passages. See foot-note further on.

heavens, for it is written [Gen. ii. 4]: "On the day that the Lord God made *earth* and heaven." Said the School of Hillel to the School of Shammai: According to your words, a man builds an upper story, and afterwards builds a house; and the heavens are the upper story, as it is written [Amos ix. 6]: "That buildeth in the heavens his steps, and hath founded his vault over the earth." Said the School of Shammai to the School of Hillel: According to you, a man makes a footstool, and afterwards makes a throne, as it is written [Is. lxvi. 1]: "Thus saith the Lord, The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool." The sages say: Both were created together, as it is written [ibid. xlviii. 13]: "My hand also hath laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand hath spanned out the heavens. I call unto them, they stand forward together."

What is meant by "heavens"? Said R. Jose bar Hanina: It means, the place where there is water. In a Boraitha it is explained as equivalent to fire and water, thus teaching that the Holy One, blessed be He, brought them and mingled them one with the other, and made from them the firmament. R. Ishmael questioned R. Aqiba when they were on the road: Thou art one who hast served for twenty-two years Na'hum, the man of "Gimzu," the man who expounded the meaning of all the particles "*eth*" (the) which are in the Law. What was his exposition of "Eth-ha-shamayim v'*eth* haaretz"? R. Aqiba answered: If the words had been simply: First created God heaven and earth, I should have said, "Heaven" is another name of God. But as it is now, all know that heaven and earth are to be taken in the literal meaning. And why do I find the expression "v'*eth* haaretz"? To show that heaven preceded the earth.

There is a Boraitha of R. Jose which says: Woe to the creatures which see and know not what they see, which stand and know not upon what they stand. Upon what does the earth stand? Upon the pillars. The pillars stand upon the waters; the waters upon the mountains; the mountains upon the wind; the wind upon the storm;* the storm is suspended upon the strength of the Holy One, blessed be He, as it is written [Deut. xxxiii. 27]: "And here beneath, the everlasting arms." The sages say: It stands upon twelve pillars, as it is

* There are here adduced biblical passages for every statement, but we omitted them, as they are not in point.

written [Deut. xxiii. 8]: "He set the bounds of the tribes according to the number of the sons of Israel." According to others, seven pillars, as it is written [Prov. ix. 1]: "She had hewn out her seven pillars." R. Elazar b. Shamua said: Upon one pillar, and its name is Zaddik (The Righteous), as it is written [Prov. x. 25]: "But the righteous is an everlasting foundation." R. Jehudah said: There are two firmaments, as it is written [Deut. x. 14]: "Behold, to the Lord thy God belong the heavens and the heavens of the heavens." Resh Lakish said, they are seven, viz.: Vilon, Rakia, Shchakim, Zbul, Maon, Makhon, Araboth. Vilon serves no purpose whatever save this, that it enters in the morning, and goes forth in the evening, and renews every day the work of creation. Rakia is that in which are set sun and moon, stars and constellations. Shchakim is that in which the millstones stand and grind manna for the righteous. Zbul is that in which is the heavenly Jerusalem and the Temple, and the altar is built there, and Michael the great prince stands and offers upon it an offering. Maon is that in which are companies of ministering angels, who utter His song in the night and are silent in the day for the sake of the glory of Israel. Resh Lakish said: Every one who studied in the Law in this world, which is like the night, the Holy One, blessed be He, stretches over him the thread of grace for the future world, which is like the day, as it is written: "By the day the Lord gives his merciful command, and by night his song is with me." Makhon is that in which are the treasures of hail, and the high dwelling-place of harmful dews and the high dwelling-place of the round drops, and the chamber of the whirlwind and of the storm, and the retreat of noisome vapor; and their doors are made of fire. Araboth is that in which are righteousness and judgment and grace, the treasures of life and the treasures of peace and the treasures of blessing, and the souls of the righteous and the spirits and souls which are about to be created, and the dew with which the Holy One, blessed be He, is about to quicken mortals. There also are celestials and seraphs and holy beings and ministering angels and the throne of glory, and the King, the Living God, high and lifted up, sitting over them among the clouds, and darkness and cloud and thick darkness surround Him. How is there darkness in the presence of the Lord? Is it not written [Dan. ii. 22]: "He is that revealeth what is deep and secret: he knoweth what is in the darkness, and the light dwelleth with him"? This presents no difficulty.

The one refers to that which is within, the other to that which is without. R. A'ha bar Jacob said: There is again a firmament above the heads of the living creatures, for it is written [Ezek. i. 22]: "And the likeness of a vault was over the head of the living creatures, shining like the glitter of the purest crystal." So far thou hast permission to speak. Thenceforward thou hast not permission to speak. For thus it is written in the book of Ben Sira: Seek not out the things that are too hard for thee, and into the things that are hidden from thee inquire thou not. In what is permitted to thee instruct thyself; thou must not discuss secret things.

We have learned in a Boraitha: Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai said: What answer did the heavenly voice make to that wicked man at the time when he said [Is. xiv. 14], "I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be equal to the Most High"? The heavenly voice said to him: Thou wicked man, son of a wicked man, grandson of Nimrod the Wicked, who led all the world to rebel against Him in his kingdom, how many are the years of a man? Seventy years, as it is said [Ps. xc. 10]: "The days of our years in this life are seventy years, and if by uncommon vigor they be eighty . . ." And is not from the earth to the firmament a journey of five hundred years, and so too the interspace of the firmaments? Above there are the holy living creatures. The feet of the living creatures are of corresponding measure to all the things mentioned above, the ankles of the living creatures are of corresponding measure, the legs of the living creatures are of corresponding measure, the knees of the living creatures are of corresponding measure, the thighs of the living creatures are of corresponding measure, the bodies of the living creatures are of corresponding measure, the necks of the living creatures are of corresponding measure, the heads of the living creatures are of corresponding measure, the horns of the living creatures are of corresponding measure. Above them is the throne of glory. The feet of the throne of glory are of corresponding measure. The throne of glory is of corresponding measure. The King, the Living and Eternal God, high and lifted up, sitteth upon them. And thou didst say: "I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be equal to the Most High"? Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the uttermost parts of the pit.

"Nor the divine chariot with one." R. Hyya taught: But you may impart to him the quintessence of the chapters. Said

R. Zera : Even that may only be imparted to a chief of the Beth Din, and only then when his heart yearns for knowledge.

R. Ami said : The secrets of the Law may be imparted only to the one who has the five prescribed things, viz. [Is. iii. 3] : "The captain of fifty, and the honorable man, and the counselor, and the skilful artificer, and the eloquent orator." R. Johanan said to R. Elazar : Come, I will fully instruct thee in the subject of the divine chariot. He said to him : I am not old enough. When he was old enough, R. Johanan's soul had passed away. R. Asi said to him : Come, I will fully instruct thee in the subject of the divine chariot. He said to him : If I had been worthy, I should have received full instruction from R. Johanan, thy teacher. R. Joseph was giving full instruction in the subject of the divine chariot. The sages of Pumbeditha were teaching the subject of creation. They said to him : Would the master instruct us fully in the subject of the divine chariot ? He answered them : Instruct me in the subject of creation. After they had instructed him, they said to him : Would the master instruct us in the subject of the divine chariot ? He answered : In reference to this we have learned in a Boraitha : It is written [Song of Songs iv. 11] : "Honey and milk are under thy tongue." That means, let words sweeter than honey and milk be under thy tongue. R. Abuhu infers the same thing from the following passage [Prov. xxvii. 26] : "The sheep are for thy clothing." That means, things that are the secrets of the world shall be under thy clothes. They said to him : We have worked in them as far as the words [Ezek. ii. 1] : "And he said unto me, Son of man." And he said to them : But this is the real subject of the divine chariot.

The rabbis taught : It happened once that a certain child, who was reading in his teacher's house in the Book of Ezekiel, was pondering over 'Hashmal, and there came out fire from 'Hashmal and burnt him, and they sought in consequence to conceal the Book of Ezekiel. Said Hananiah b. Hezkyah to them : If he was wise, are then all wise ?

It is written [Ezek. i. 4] : "And I saw, and behold, a storm wind came out of the north, a great cloud, and a flaming fire, and a brightness was on it round about ; and out of the midst of it was like the glitter of amber, out of the midst of the fire." Whither did it go ? Said R. Jehudah in the name of Rabh : It went forth to subdue the whole world under the wicked Nebuchadnezzar. And this was done that the nations might not

say: The Holy One, blessed be He, delivered His children into the hands of a low nation. The Holy One, blessed be He, said: What forced Me to minister to worshippers of carved images? The iniquities of Israel, they forced me. It is written [ibid. i. 15]: "And I looked on the living creatures, and behold, there was one wheel upon the earth close by the living creatures." Said R. Elazar: It means a certain angel who stands upon the earth, and his head reaches to the level of the living creatures. In a Tosephtha we are taught that his name is Sandalphon, who is higher than his fellows by the space of a journey of five hundred years, and he stands behind the divine chariot and binds crowns for his Creator. This is not so, as it is written [Ezek. iii. 12]: "Blessed be the glory of the Lord from his place." From this we may infer that His place is impossible to know? He utters one of the holy names of the Lord over the wreath, and thereupon he goes and rests by His head. Rabha said: All which Ezekiel saw Isaiah saw, but Ezekiel was like a villager who saw the king for the first time (and therefore he said all that he has seen); Isaiah, however, was like a townsman who has often seen the king (and therefore he said little).

Resh Lakish said: What is the meaning of the passage [Ex. xv. 1]: "I will sing unto the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously"? It means a song to Him who takes His place proudly above the high, as the Master said: The king among living creatures is a lion; the king among domestic beasts is an ox; the king among birds is an eagle, but man takes his place proudly above them, and the Holy One, blessed be He, takes His place proudly above them all, and above the whole world in its entirety. We have learned in a Boraitha: Rabbi said in the name of Abba Jose b. Dosai: It is written [Dan. vii. 10]: "Thousand times thousands ministered unto him." This is the number of one troop, but *all* his troops cannot be numbered. R. Jeremiah bar Abba, however, said: This passage refers to the fiery stream, as it is written [ibid., ibid.]: "A stream of fire issued and came forth from before him; thousand times thousands ministered unto him; and myriad times myriads stood before him." Whence does it come forth? From the perspiration of the living creatures. And upon what is it poured? Said R. Zutra bar Tobiah in the name of Rabh: Upon the heads of the wicked men in Gehenna, as it is written [Jer. xxiii. 19]: "Behold, the storm wind of the Lord is gone forth in fury; yea, a whirling storm upon the head of the wicked shall it fall grievously." R.

A'ha bar Jacob said : Upon those who were held back, as it is written [Job xxii. 16] : "Who were shrivelled up before their time, whose foundation was flooded away like a river?" There is a Boraitha to the effect that R. Simeon the Pious said : There are nine hundred and seventy-four generations which were held back from being created. The Holy One, blessed be He, scattered them through all the successive generations, and these are the impudent (**עזיז פניהם**) who are in a generation. R. Na'hman bar Itz'hak, however, said : On the contrary, this passage refers to those who are wrinkled for blessing, as it is written : As for these scholars who have become wrinkled over the words of the Law in this world, the Holy One, blessed be He, discloses to them the secrets of the world to come, as it is written [Job xxii. 16] : "Whose foundation was flooded away like a river."

Samuel said to Hyyya bar Rabh : Thou son of a scholar, come and I will tell thee something of those noble words which thy father used to say : Every several day ministering angels are created from the fiery stream, and they utter a song and perish, as it is written [Lam. iii. 23] : "They are new every morning; great is thy faithfulness."

When R. Dimi came he said : Eighteen curses did Isaiah pronounce upon Israel, and he was not satisfied, until he had spoken against them this passage [Is. iii. 5] : "The boy shall demean himself proudly against the ancient, and the base against the honorable."

What are the eighteen curses? The following [Is. iii. 1-4] : "For, behold, the Lord, the Eternal of hosts, doth remove from Jerusalem and from Judah stay and staff, every stay of bread, and every stay of water. The hero and the men of war," etc., etc. "Stay"—these are the learned in the Law. "Staff"—these are the learned in the Mishna; e.g., R. Jehudah b. Tema and his fellows. [R. Papa and the rabbis differ in respect to this: One says, there were six hundred sections of Mishna, and another says, there were seven hundred sections.] "Every stay of bread"—these are the learned in Talmud, as it is written [Prov. ix. 5] : "Come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled." "And every stay of water"—these are the learned in Agada, who draw a man's heart like water by means of Agada." "The hero"—this is the man versed in oral tradition. "And the man of war"—this is he who knows how to handle matters in the battle of the Law. "The judge"—this

is a magistrate who gives decisions faithfully. "And the prophet"—this is in its literal meaning. "The prudent"—this is a king, as it is written [Prov. xvi. 10]: "There should be a wise sentence on the lips of the king." "And the ancient"—this is he who is worthy to sit as a teacher presiding over an academy. "The captain of fifty"—this is in accordance with R. Abuhu, who saith: From this we may infer, that an interpreter who is less than fifty years old is not appointed over the congregation. "And the honorable man"—this is he for whose merits his generation is forgiven; by Heaven (*e.g.*, R. Hanina b. Dosa); in this world (*e.g.*, R. Abuhu in the house of Cæsar). "And the counsellor"—one who knows how to intercalate years and to fix months. "And the skilful"—this is the disciple who, by his keenness, sharpens the minds of his teachers. "Artificer"—at the time he is unfolding the words of the Law all are made like deaf men.* "And the eloquent"—this is he who, having knowledge of one thing, can derive therefrom knowledge of another thing.† "Orator"—this is he to whom it is fitting to impart the words of the Law, which is given in a whisper (*e.g.*, the subject of the divine chariot. See page 21). "And I will set up boys as their princes"—that is, as R. Elazar said: These are men who are deprived of good works.‡ "And children shall rule over them"—as R. A'ha bar Jacob said: These are foxes and sons of foxes.§ And he was not satisfied until he had said to them: "The boy shall demean himself proudly against the ancient," etc. [ibid., ibid.]—these are the men who are deprived of good works. They shall demean themselves proudly against the one who is filled with good works as a pomegranate. "And the base against the honorable"—*i.e.*, that one to whom heavy sins are like light ones will demean himself proudly against the one to whom light sins are like heavy ones.

R. Kattina said: Even at the time of the destruction of

* The Hebrew term is חֲרִישִׁים, and is explained to have the same meaning as שְׁמַרְתָּן, a deaf man.

† The Hebrew terms are שְׁלֵמֶן, בְּבִין, the literal meaning of which is "the instructed whisperer," but we give in the text Loesser's translation.

‡ The Hebrew term is גַּעֲרִים, which means also "to shake off, to be deprived," as in (Judges xvi. 20) אֲגַעֲרָה.

§ The Hebrew term is מִלְאָקָה, and is interpreted here as derived from the Aramaic לְאָקָה, a fox; *i.e.*, men who are shrewd as a fox, but deprived of any good qualifications.

Jerusalem there did not cease from them faithful men. Is that so? Did we not learn: Rabha said: Jerusalem was not laid waste till there ceased from it faithful men, as it is written [Jer. v. 1]: "Roam about through the streets of Jerusalem, and see now, and notice, and search in its broad places, if ye can find one man, if there be one who executeth justice, that searcheth for truth: and I will pardon it"? This presents no difficulty. The former means, faithful in the study of the Law, and the latter means, honesty in common business.

The rabbis taught: It happened with Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai that he was riding upon his ass and was travelling on the road, and R. Elazar b. Arakh was behind him, as driver. Said the latter to him: Rabbi, teach me a chapter on the subject of the divine chariot. And he answered him: Have I not taught you: Nor the chariot with one individual, unless he was a wise man and had much knowledge of his own? Then he said to him: Rabbi, allow me to say before thee one thing which thou hast taught me. He allowed him. Immediately R. Johanan b. Zakkai dismounted from the ass, and wrapped himself up and seated himself upon the stone under the olive tree. R. Elazar asked him: Rabbi, wherefore didst thou dismount from the ass? He answered him: Is it right that thou shouldest investigate the subject of the divine chariot, and the Shekhina is with us and ministering angels accompany us, and that I should ride upon the ass? Then R. Elazar b. Arakh entered upon the subject of the divine chariot and lectured: And there descended fire from heaven and encircled all the terebinth trees of the field, which uttered a song. [What was the song which they uttered? [Ps. cxlviii. 7, 9, 14]: "Praise the Lord from the earth, ye sea monsters, and all deeps . . . fruitful trees and all cedars . . . Hallelujah."] An angel answered from the fire: *This is the real subject of the divine chariot.* R. Johanan arose and kissed him upon his head, and said: Blessed be the Lord God of Israel who hath given to our father Abraham a son who is able to understand and lecture on this subject. There is one who lectures well, but doth not perform well. There is one who performeth well, but does not expound well. Thou dost expound well and dost perform well. Blessed art thou, Abraham our father, from whose loins hath come forth Elazar b. Arakh.

And when these things were told to R. Joshua, he and R. Jose the priest were travelling on the road. They said: Let us also expound on the same subject. R. Joshua opened his mouth

and lectured: And it was the day of the summer solstice. The heavens were wrapped in clouds, and there appeared the form of a bow in the cloud, and the angels were assembling and coming to hearken, as the men assemble and come to look at the festivities of bridegroom and bride. R. Jose the priest went forward and related the whole occurrence to Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai, who said: Blessed are ye, and blessed is she that bare you. Blessed are mine eyes, that they have thus seen. And also in my dream I and ye were resting upon Mount Sinai, and a heavenly voice was heard, which said: Come up hither, come up hither. Large banqueting chambers are prepared and fair coverlets are spread for you, you and your disciples and your disciples' disciples, as fitted to attain to the third degree of blessedness.

Is it so? Have we not learned in a Boraitha: R. Jose in the name of R. Jehudah said: There were three consecutive expositions. R. Joshua explained things before R. Johanan b. Zakkai; R. Aqiba explained things before R. Joshua; Hananiah b. Hachinai explained before R. Aqiba. Hence we see that R. Elazar b. Arakh was not mentioned. (This presents no difficulty:) He who teaches and before whom others teach is mentioned, while he who teaches and before whom others do not teach is not mentioned. But was not Hananiah b. Hachinai one who taught and before whom others did not teach? And still he was mentioned? Yea, for he taught at least in the presence of one who taught others.

The rabbis taught: Four men went up into the heavenly garden,* and they were: Ben Azzai and Ben Zoma, A'her and R. Aqiba. Ben Azzai gazed and died;† to him the scriptural passage may be applied [Ps. cxvi. 15]: "Grievous in the eyes of the Lord is the death of his pious ones." Ben Zoma gazed and went mad; to him the scriptural passage may be applied [Prov. xxv. 16]: "Hast thou found honey? eat so much as is sufficient for thee, lest thou consume too much of it, and have to vomit it forth." A'her cut the plants.‡ R. Aqiba departed

* The Hebrew term is *Pardes*, meaning "a garden"; the commentaries explain it to mean "heavenly." Tosaphoth states: "They did not go up literally, but it appeared to them as if they went up." See Streane's "Hagigah," p. 83.

† In the Palestinian Talmud it reads: Ben Zoma gazed and died; Ben Azzai gazed and was injured. This seems to be the more correct, as can be seen from many other places in the Babylonian Talmud and Tosephtha. See our "Eben Ha-rosha," at the end.

‡ These terms are used because he speaks of a garden; i.e., in some way made bad use of his learning.

in peace.* A'her cut the plants; it is to him that the scriptural passage may be applied [Eccl. v. 6]: "Suffer not thy mouth to cause thy body to sin." There came out a heavenly voice and said [Jer. iii. 14]: "Return, O backsliding children" (except A'her). When he learned it he said: Inasmuch as that man is excluded from yonder world, let him go and enjoy himself in this world. A'her went forth into evil courses. A'her asked this question of R. Meir, after he had gone forth into evil courses: What is the meaning of the passage [Eccl. vii. 14]: "Also this hath God made in equal measure with the other"? He answered him: Everything which the Holy One, blessed be He, created, He created with its counterpart. He created mountains; He created hills: He created seas; He created rivers. He said to him: R. Aqiba thy teacher did not say so, but he explained it as meaning that He created righteous; He created sinners: He created the Garden of Eden; He created Gehenna. To every individual belongs two shares, one in the Garden of Eden and one in Gehenna. If one is meritorious and righteous, he receives his own portion and also the portion of his neighbor in the Garden of Eden. If he has incurred guilt, he receives his own portion and also the portion of his neighbor in Gehenna. [R. Mesharshia said: What is the Scripture proof? As regards the righteous it is written [Is. lxi. 7]: "Therefore in their hand shall they possess a twofold (portion)"; as regards the wicked it is said [Jer. xvii. 18]: "And strike them with a double breach."]

A'her asked again of R. Meir: What is the meaning of the passage [Job xxviii. 17]: "She cannot be estimated after gold and glass; and not in exchange for her (can) vessels of refined gold (be taken)"? He answered him: These are the words of the Law, which are difficult to buy, as vessels of gold and of pure gold, and are easily lost, as vessels of glass. He said to him: R. Aqiba thy teacher did not say so, but he explained it as meaning that as vessels of gold and vessels of glass, although they are broken, may be mended, so a disciple of the sages, although he have sinned, may be mended. He said to him: Return thyself also. He answered him: I have already heard from behind the curtain [Jer. iii. 14]: "Return, O backsliding children" (except A'her).

* We have omitted here a question put to Ben Zoma, for the reason that the same was inserted in the Talmud not by the Talmudists. See our "Eben Sapir," p. 56. Also, what happened to Ben Zoma with R. Jehoshua b. Hananiah, as it seems to us the version of the Palestinian Talmud is correct. See note above.

The rabbis taught: It happened that A'her was riding upon his horse on the Sabbath, and R. Meir was walking behind him to learn the Law from his mouth. He said to him: Meir, turn thee backwards, for I have already measured by means of my horse's hoofs up to this point the legal limit of the Sabbath. He answered him: Return thyself also. He said to him: And have I not already answered thee what I have heard from behind the curtain? He forced him to enter a place of lecturing. He said to a child: Repeat for me thy verse. He said to him [Is. xlvi.ii. 22]: "There is no peace, saith the Lord, unto the wicked." He brought him to another synagogue, until he had brought him into thirteen synagogues. They all repeated to him the same way. In the last one he said to him: Repeat for me thy verse. He said to him [Ps. i. 16]: "But unto the wicked God saith: What hast thou to do to relate my statutes, and why bearest thou my covenant upon thy mouth?" That child was a stammerer. It sounded as if he had said: "And to Elisha said God," etc.* And he said: If there had been a knife in my hand I would have cut him in pieces.

When A'her died it was said: Let him not be brought into judgment (because he has studied the Law), but let him not be admitted to the world to come (because he sinned). R. Meir said: It would have been better if he would have been brought to judgment and punished, and then admitted to the world to come. I wish I would die, in order that smoke should go up from his grave (*i.e.*, that he should be brought to judgment). When R. Meir died it was so: smoke went up from the grave of A'her. Said R. Johanan: A mighty deed it was to consign his teacher to the flames. There was one among us, and we should not find a way to save him? If I take him by the hand, who will snatch him away from me? Would that I might die and extinguish the smoke from his grave. And it was so. When R. Johanan died the smoke ceased from the grave of A'her. The public mourner then uttered this expression over him: Even the keeper of the door of Gehenna stood not his ground before thee, O our teacher!

The daughter of A'her came to Rabbi and asked him for food. He said to her: Whose daughter art thou? She an-

* The Hebrew term is "Ul'roscha" ("to the wicked"), and because of the stammering it sounded as "Ul'Elisha," which was the true name of ר'נשא, this latter meaning "another"—*i.e.*, not Elisha, because it was not believed that the great Tana Elisha should have deserted the true teachings.

swwered : I am the daughter of A'her. And he said to her: Is there still of his seed in the world? Is it not written [Job xviii. 19]: "He will have neither son nor grandson among his people, nor any that escapeth in the places of his sojourning"? She said to him: Remember his studiousness, and not his deeds. Immediately there came down fire, and consumed the seat of Rabbi. Rabbi wept and said : And if those who disgrace themselves through it, are honored thus, how much more those who obtain praise through their use of it.

How did R. Meir study the Law from the mouth of A'her? Have we not learned (see Tract Moed Katan) that if it is not certain that the rabbi is equal to an angel, no instruction must be received from him? Said Resh Lakish: R. Meir interpreted the following passage thus [Prov. xxii. 17]: "Incline thine ear, and hear the words of the wise, and apply thy heart unto my knowledge." It is not written, "Unto *their* knowledge," but "unto *My* knowledge." R. Hanina said the following passage [Ps. xlv. 11]: "Hearken, O daughter, and look and incline thy ear, and forget thy own people, and thy father's houses," etc. But do not these passages contradict each other? Nay, the one is the case of an adult, the other of a young person (who cannot distinguish between good and evil).

When R. Dimi came he said: They say in the West: R. Meir, while eating the date, he threw away the stone (*i.e.*, he picked out the good and threw away the bad teachings).

Rabha expounded the meaning of the passage [Song of Songs vi. 11]: "Into the nut-garden was I gone down, to look about among the plants of the valley," etc. Why are scholars likened to a nut? It means to say that, as a nut, although soiled, what is within it is clean: so also, although a scholar has sinned, his study of the law is not rejected.

Rabba bar Shila met Elijah and said to him: What is the Holy One, blessed be He, doing? He answered him: He had uttered doctrine in the name of all other rabbis, but in the name of R. Meir He had not uttered. He said to him: Why? Because he learned doctrine from the mouth of A'her. He said to him again: Why? R. Meir found a pomegranate. He ate its inside and cast away its husk. He answered him: He is at this moment saying: Meir my son is speaking and says: At the time that men were afflicted, the Shekhina used the following language: My head and my arm are heavy on me (*i.e.*, I am sorry that the men I have created have to die for their sins). If the

Holy One, blessed be He, is thus grieved when the blood of wicked men is poured out, how much more when the blood of the righteous man is poured out.

Samuel found R. Jehudah when the latter was swinging upon the bolt of a door and weeping. He said to him: Is it a small thing that is written concerning the rabbis [Is. xxxiii. 18]: "Where is he who wrote down? where is he that weighed? where is he that counted the towers"? "Where is he that counted?" for they counted all the letters that are in the Books of the Law. "Where is he that weighed?" for they weighed the light and the heavy things which are in the Law. "Where is he that counted the towers?" for they taught three hundred doctrines concerning the tower which flies in the air. And R. Ami said: Three hundred questions were treated by Doeg and Ahithophel concerning the tower which flies in the air. And we learned, however, in a Mishna (Tract Sanhedrin, chap. xi. 1): Three kings and four private persons have no position in the world to come, and we—what will there be for us? He said to him: Oh, clever one, there was uncleanness in their hearts.

It was said about A'her: Greek melody ceased not from his mouth, as it was said of him (A'her), that at the time when he stood up to go out of the college many books of the Minim used to fall from his lap.

Nimus of Gardi * asked R. Meir: Does all wool which goes down to the dyeing-vat come up with the right color? He answered him: All which was clean on its mother's (sheep's) back does so come up; all which was not clean on its mother's back does not so come up.

It is said above: R. Aqiba went into the heavenly garden in peace and came down from it in peace. And it is to him that the scriptural passage may be applied [Song of Songs i. 4]: "Oh, draw me! after thee will we run." Nevertheless R. Aqiba was also in danger of being thrust away by the angels, but the Holy One, blessed be He, said to them: Leave this elder, for he is worthy to avail himself of My glory.

What kept R. Aqiba from being misled, as was A'her? The passage [I Kings xix. 11, 12]: "But not in the wind was the Lord; and after the wind was an earthquake, but not in the

* Nimus of Gardi was a Gentile, and it is stated of him in Midrash that he was one of the greatest men that ever lived among the nations. The modern writers differ very much as to who he was, but we showed in our "Saneiger," p. 193, that he was one of the judges of the Supreme Criminal Courts of Gardum.

earthquake was the Lord ; and after the earthquake was a fire, but not in the fire was the Lord ; and after the fire was the sound of a soft whisper. And, behold, the Lord passed by " (*i. e.*, from the whisper he understood that there was the Shekhina).

The rabbis taught : Six things are said with regard to demons, three in which they are like the angels: they have wings, they float from one end of the world to the other, and they know what is about to be ; and three in which they are like men : they eat and drink, they are fruitful and multiply, and they are mortal.

Six things are said with regard to men, three in which they are like angels: they have knowledge like the angels, they go with stature erect, and they speak in the holy language; and three like the beasts : they eat and drink like beasts, and they are fruitful and multiply, and they relieve nature.

"Every one who does not respect the glory," etc. What is meant by this? Said R. Joseph : This is the man who commits a transgression secretly. This is in accordance with R. Itz'hak, who said : Every one who committeth a transgression secretly is as though he jarred the feet of the Shekhina, as it is written [Is. lxvi. 1] : "Thus hath said the Lord, The heaven is my throne and the earth is my foot-stool." But this is not so, for R. Alea the Elder said (in Tract Moed Katan), that in such a case he may go to a place where he is not known? (as it will be explained in Moed Katan). This presents no difficulty. The former is the case of a man who has found a means of checking his evil nature ; the other, of one who is not able to do so.

R. Jehudah in the name of R. Na'hmani, the interpreter of Resh Lakish, lectured : Every one who gazes upon three things, his eyes grow weak, viz. : upon the bow, and the prince, and the priests. Upon the bow, for it is written [Ezek. i. 28] : "Like the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud on the day of rain . . . this was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord." Upon the prince, for it is written [Num. xxvii. 20] : "And thou shalt put some of thy greatness upon him."* He that gazeth upon the priests—this has to do with the time that the Temple was in existence, when they stood upon their platform and blessed Israel in the ineffable name.

The same lectured again in the name of the same authority :

* Such hagadical statements must not be taken literally, merely in their allegorical sense. Some of them we will explain in our introduction to the Hagadah.

It is written [Mic. vii. 5] : " Trust ye not in a friend, put ye not confidence in a confidant." It means, if the evil imagination say to thee, Do thou sin and the Lord will forgive, be not persuaded, as it is written: " Trust ye not in an evil one ";* and " an evil one " is nothing but the evil imagination, as it is written [Gen. viii. 21]: " The imagination of a man's heart is evil "; and there is no " guide " but the Lord, as it is written [Jer. iii. 4]: " My father, the guide of my youth art thou." Perhaps one might say, Who witnesseth against me? The stones of a man's house and the timbers of his house, these witness against him, as it is written [Hab. ii. 11]: " For the stone will cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the wood (work) will answer it." The sages say: The soul of a man witnesseth against him, as it is written [Mic. vii. 5]: " From her that lieth in thy bosom guard the doors of thy mouth." What is this that lieth in a man's bosom? Say, it is the soul. R. Zerika said: The two angels which lead him, these witness against him, as it is written [Ps. xcii. 11]: " For his angels will he give charge concerning thee, to guard thee on all thy ways." Others say: The limbs of one's body testify against him, as it is written [Is. xliv. 12]: " And ye are my witness, saith the Lord, and I am God."

MISHNA: Jose b. Joezer says that one must not lay on his hand (on a sacrifice on a biblical festival), but Joseph b. Johanan says that one may. Joshua b. P'r'a'ha says that one must not lay it, but Mathai the Arbelite says that one may. Jehudah b. Tabbai says that one must not, but Simeon b. Sheta'h says he should. Sh'maia says he must, but Abtalian says he must not. Hillel and Mena'hem did not differ. Mena'hem went out (left the Sanhedrin); Shammai entered it. Shammai says one must not; Hillel says one may. The first of the several pairs were princes, the second to them were chiefs of the court.

GEMARA: The rabbis taught: In the three former pairs, which say that a man is not to lay, and in the two latter pairs, which say that a man is to lay, the first were princes and the second chiefs of the court. So said R. Meir. But the sages say: Jehudah b. Tabbai was a chief of the court and Simeon b. Sheta'h was a prince.

" *Mena'hem went out,*" etc. Whither did he go out? Said Rabha: He went out from the service of the king. We have

* The Hebrew term is יְלֵד, which is here read as יְלֵד, "evil."

learned in a Boraitha : Mena'hem went out from the service of the king, and there went out with him eighty pairs of disciples clothed in Syrian robes. Said R. Shaman bar Abba in the name of R. Johanan : Let a rabbinical decree concerning the Sabbath not be a light thing in thine eyes, for the laying on of the hand is only a rabbinical prohibition, and the greatest men of the different generations were divided upon this matter. Is this not self-evident ? He comes to teach us that even a rabbinical prohibition which is seemingly contrary to a positive command of the Bible must also not be light in thine eyes. But this is also self-evident from the teachings of our Mishna ? This is needed to object to those who say that they differ not as to the rabbinical prohibition, but as to the laying on of the hand itself, because they maintain that the laying on of the hand is necessary only in case of a voluntary peace-offering, but not in that of an obligatory peace-offering.*

Said Rami bar Hama : Infer from this that the laying on of the hands must be with all one's strength, because if we would imagine that all the strength is not necessary, what labor is it or what is he doing to the animal that the rabbis prohibited it on the festival ?

An objection was raised : We have learned elsewhere : It is written [Lev. i. 2-4] : " Speak unto the children of Israel . . . and he shall lay his hand." *He*—the males, but not the females of Israel. R. Jose and R. Simeon, however, said that the females of Israel, if they wish, they may lay on their hands (although it is not obligatory for them); and R. Jose added to this : My father Elazar told me that it happened once that we had a calf of peace-offering, and we brought it to the department of the women, and the latter laid their hands on it. It was not because the laying on of the hands belongs to women, but so as to gratify them. Now, if you think that the laying on of the hand must be with all one's strength, would it be right, in order to gratify the women, to allow them to do labor with the holy things? Infer, therefore, from this that it is not necessary to use all the strength. Nay, maybe it *is* necessary, but in that case it was told to the women to lay on their hands lightly. If so, why does R. Jose say : Not because the laying on of the hands belongs to women, etc. Let him say, because it was not con-

* What is a voluntary and what is an obligatory peace-offering will be explained in Tract Mena'oth.

sidered laying on at all? Said R. Ami: He meant both, firstly, because it was not considered laying on the hands at all; and, secondly, in order to gratify the women.

MISHNA: The House of Shammai say: A peace-offering may be brought without laying the hands on them, but not burnt-offerings. But the House of Hillel say: Both peace-offerings and burnt-offerings may be brought, and also lay the hands on them.

In the case of Pentecost, which falls upon the eve of a Sabbath, the House of Shammai say: The day for sacrificing is after the Sabbath. But the House of Hillel say: There is no day for sacrificing after the Sabbath. Both, however, admit that if it fall upon a Sabbath the day for sacrificing is the day after the Sabbath. And on that day (which is called the day of sacrificing) a high-priest is not to clothe himself in his costly garments, unless in case of a mourning or of a fast. The prohibition was in order not to confirm the words of those who say, "Pentecost is after the Sabbath (only).

GEMARA: (The Gemara begins with the saying of R. Elazar in the name of R. Oshiyah, that the Pentecost-offering is transferable to all the six succeeding days, and repeats here all the statement contained in Tract Rosh Hashana, p. 6, lines 15-29.)

"In the case of Pentecost which falls on the eve of a Sabbath," etc. Does that not mean that there is no day at all for sacrificing? Nay, it means that a substituted day is necessary for this. But what does it come to teach us—that it shall be sacrificed on the very day of the festival? Was this not discussed already in the beginning of our Mishna? It is needed. For if the statement would be in the latter paragraph only, one might say that the School of Shammai hold so because it can be done on the morrow, but if it fall on the eve of a Sabbath, when it cannot be done on the morrow, they agree with the School of Hillel; and if the statement would be in the first paragraph only, one might say that the School of Hillel allow it to be sacrificed on the very day of the festival because it cannot be done on the morrow, but when the Pentecost falls on the Sabbath day, they agree with the House of Shammai; therefore both statements are needed. (An objection was raised:) Come and hear: He who has not kept the feast for the seven days of the Passover, and the eight days of the Feast of Tabernacles, and the first day of Pentecost, he cannot afterwards keep the

feast. Did this not include also the day of Pentecost, that it has no compensation? (*i.e.*, if not sacrificed on the very festival, it cannot be done so on any other day). Nay, it means the last day of compensation.

The disciples of R. Eliezer b. Jacob taught: It is written [Lev. xxiii. 21, 22]: "And ye shall proclaim." "And when ye reap." What is the feast in which thou makest proclamation and reapest? Thou must say, it is the Feast of Pentecost. Now, let us see. When is it? If I am to say on the holiday itself, how is reaping lawful on a holiday? We must then say, it means the completion days. Resh Lakish, however, said: It is inferred from the following passage [Ex. xxiii. 16]: "And the feast of the harvest." What is the feast on which thou feasteſt and reapest? Thou must say, it is the Pentecost. When is it? If I am to say, on the holiday itself, how is reaping lawful on a holiday? We must then say, it means the completion days. Said R. Johanan: According to thee, the Feast of Ingathering. What is the feast in which there is an ingathering? Thou must then say, it is the Feast of Tabernacles. When is it? Shall I say, on the holiday itself? How is work lawful on a holiday? And if you will say, that it means on one of the middle days? But even then is work allowed on those days? Therefore we must say, that it means the feast that falls during the time of the gathering in. Say, also, this is the case here.

We see from this that both are of the opinion that on the middle days the doing of work is forbidden. Whence do we deduce this? From the following Boraitha: It is written [Lev. xxiii. 8]: "No servile work shall ye do." That means, that on the middle days the doing of work is forbidden. So said R. Jose the Galilean. R. Aqiba says: It was not necessary, because it is written [*ibid.* 4]: "These are the feasts of the Lord," etc. With reference to what is the Scripture speaking? If to the first day, it has been already called a Sabbath day; if to the seventh day, it has also been already called a Sabbath day. We must therefore say, it refers to the middle days, to teach that doing of work is forbidden thereon.

There is another Boraitha: It is written [Deut. xvi. 8]: "Six days shalt thou eat unleavened bread, and on the seventh day shall be a solemn assembly to the Lord thy God: thou shalt do no work." As on the seventh day work is prohibited, so also on the six days. But one might say, as on the seventh day no work at all is to be done, so also on the six days; therefore it is

written [ibid.] : "And on the seventh day shall be a solemn assembly . . . thou shalt not work," thus indicating that on the seventh day no work at all shall be done, but on the six days there is not a prohibition from *all* work. Consequently, the Scripture has communicated only to the sages that they can decree on which days work is and on which work is not allowed, and what labor may and what labor may not be done, etc.

"But it is allowed in case of a mourning or of a fast after the Sabbath." But have we not learned in a Boraitha: It happened that Alexis died in Luda, and all Israel assembled to mourn him, and R. Tarphon had not allowed them because it was the festival? Now, if it was the festival itself, how did they come to assemble at all? We must therefore say, it was on the day of sacrificing, and hence we see even on those days it is not allowed to mourn? The Mishna refers to a case when the Pentecost falls on a Sabbath. And the case of Alexis was when it fell on the first day of the week.

MISHNA : One may wash his hands for common food and for second-tithes and for heave-offerings, but for hallowed things they must be bathed legally. For the sin-offering, if one's hands be defiled, his whole body is defiled.

If he have dipped for common food, he has credit as clean for common food, but is forbidden tithe; if for tithe, he has credit for tithe, but not for heave-offering; if for heave-offering, he has credit for heave-offering, but not sacred things; if for sacred things, he has credit for sacred things, but not sin-offering. If for a weightier thing (more rigorous), he is free for a lighter thing (lenient). If he have dipped without any intention for cleanliness, it is as though he had not dipped.

The garments of a common person are defiled by pressure (*i.e.*, are looked upon as affected by uncleanness arising from pressure) for Pharisees; the garments of Pharisees are defiled by pressure for those that eat heave-offering; the garments of those that eat heave-offering are defiled by pressure for those that partake of sacred things; the garments of those that partake of sacred things are defiled by pressure for those that partake of sin-offering. Jose b. Joezer was the most pious among the priests, and yet his apron was defiled by pressure for those that partake of sacred things. Johanan b. Gudgodah was one who ate his ordinary food all his days with observance of the laws of purification which belong to sacred things, and yet his apron was defiled by pressure for those that partake of sin-offering.

GEMARA: Is, then, for common food and tithes, washing of hands needed? (Have we not learned elsewhere that it is not needed?) This presents no difficulty: The one has to do with bread, the other with fruit. For R. Na'hman said: Every one who washes his hands for fruit is overscrupulous and affected.

"He that dips for common food and has credit for common food," etc. According to whom is our Mishna? Shall we say it is according to the rabbis, for they make a distinction between common food and tithes? According to whom, then, would be the latter part of the Mishna: The garments of a common person are defiled by pressure for Pharisees; the garments of Pharisees are defiled by pressure for those that eat heave-offering? which is certainly in accordance with R. Meir, who says, common food and tithes are exactly the same? Then this conclusion would be that the former part is according to the rabbis, and the latter part according to R. Meir? Yea, it is so. R. A'ha bar Ada, however, teaches in the latter part five orders, and establishes it all according to the rabbis.

CHAPTER III.

REGULATIONS REGARDING IN WHAT CASES SACRED THINGS ARE MORE RIGOROUS THAN HEAVE-OFFERINGS, AND VICE VERSA.

MISHNA: More rigorous rules hold in sacred things than in a heave-offering, for we may dip vessels in the midst of vessels for a heave-offering, but not for sacred things. The outside and the inside and the place for laying hold are reckoned as distinct in the heave-offering, but not in the sacred things. One who takes up that which has been made unclean by pressure, may offer the heave-offering, but not the sacred things. The garments of those that eat the heave-offering are unclean through pressure in regard to sacred things. The manner of the heave-offering is not as the manner of the sacred things. For in the case of sacred things, one loosens a knot and wipes and dips and afterwards ties up again, but in the case of a heave-offering he ties up and afterwards dips.

Vessels finished in purity need dipping for sacred things, but not for a heave-offering. The vessel includes what is within it for sacred things, but not for heave-offering.

The unclean in the fourth degree in the case for sacred things is disqualified, but in the third degree in the case of heave-offering.

Though one of his hands be unclean in the case of heave-offering, its fellow is clean; in the case of sacred things, however, both are dipped, for the hand makes its fellow unclean in the case of hallowed things, but not in the case of heave-offering. One may eat dry food with ordinary (not ceremonially clean) hands in the case of heave-offering, but not in the case of sacred things.

A mourner, before the burial of the dead (who has not defiled himself yet on the dead), and one who lacks atonement, need dipping in a legal bath for sacred things, but not for heave-offering.

GEMARA: "*In sacred things.*" Why are sacred things more rigorous? Said R. Aila: Because the weight of the inside vessel intervenes. Shall we assume, that as the reason for the

statement in the latter part of the Mishna is because of intervention, the first part has another reason? (For if both have one and the same reason, why state both? One would suffice.) Nay, both the earlier and the later cases are because of intervention, and still it was necessary that they should be separately mentioned, for if he had taught us the first only, one should say, *this* is the reason for the rigorousness of sacred things, viz.: because of the vessel's weight, which actually exists. But in the latter case, where the vessel's weight is not an element, one should say, in regard to sacred things, that it is not considered an intervention; and if he had taught us the latter only, one should say, the reason why it is not allowed for sacred things is because a knot in water is drawn tighter, while in the former case the water makes the vessel to swim, and so the intervention is not considered. Thus it was necessary that they should be separately mentioned. R. Aila is in accordance with his theory elsewhere, who said in the name of R. Hanina bar Papa: Ten degrees of superior excellence are taught here. The first five refer alike to sacred things, and to ordinary things which are treated with the observance of the law of purification belonging to sacred things; the latter refer to sacred things only. Why so? Because the former five could constitute a biblical defilement (when he dips one vessel in another vessel, and an intervention would be discovered). The rabbis have ordained that they apply to both. The later one, however, in which there can be no biblical defilement, the rabbis did not care to ordain.

Rabha, however, said: Since the later portion of the Mishna is on account of intervention, the former is not on that account, but because it is a precautionary measure, in order that needles and pipes should not be dipped in a vessel, the mouth of which is not of the size of the pipe of a wine-skin bottle. (This will be explained in Mikwooth, VI., 7.) And Rabha holds in this case, as R. Na'hman said elsewhere in the name of Rabba bar Abuha, viz.: Eleven features of superior excellence are taught here. The first six refer alike to sacred things and to ordinary things which are treated with the observance of the laws of purification belonging to sacred things. The latter ones refer to sacred things only. What real difference is there between Rabha and R. Aila? It is this: In the case of a basket and a wine-strainer which are filled with vessels and dipped. According to the one who says, the prohibition is because of intervention, there is an intervention; but according to the one who says, that it is a

precautionary measure, lest haply needles and pipes should be dipped in a vessel, the mouth of which is not of the size of the pipe of a wine-skin bottle, there is no such thing in a basket and a wine-strainer.

"The outsides and the insides," etc. What is meant by this? As we have learned in a Mishna [Kelim, XXV., 6]: In the case of a vessel the outside of which is defiled by beverages, its outside is defiled, but its inside, its rim, and its short handles, and its long handles are clean; but if its inside is defiled, it is all defiled.

"And the place for laying hold," etc. What is meant by Beth Hazibyah? Said R. Jehudah in the name of Samuel: The part by which he reaches it, as it is written [Ruth ii. 14]: "And he reached her parched corn" (Vaitzboth). R. Asi in the name of R. Johanan said: It means that part of the dish of which fastidious persons lay hold.

"One that takes up that which has been made unclean," etc. Why not sacred things? Because of the following occurrence: R. Jehudah in the name of R. Samuel said: It happened to a certain man, who was carrying a cask of wine from one place to another, and the thong of his sandal came off, and he took it up and placed it on the mouth of the cask, and it fell into the inside of the cask, and it was made unclean. And thereupon it was ordained: One that taketh up that which has been made unclean by pressure may offer the heave-offering, but not the sacred things. If so, why not also the heave-offering? This is in accordance with R. Hananiah b. Aqabia, who said: This restriction was made only as regards Jordan or a ship, and in accordance with the matter that occurred. What was that? It was that which R. Jehudah said in the name of Rabh: It happened with a man who was carrying the sprinkling water and the ashes of the red cow over Jordan in a ship, and a piece of a dead body as large as an olive was found fixed in the bottom of the ship; thereupon it was ordained that such a thing should not happen again.

"Vessels finished in purity," etc. Finished by whom? If a learned man has finished them, why should they be dipped? If a learned man has finished them, how is it that the Mishna calls them "finished in purity"? Said Rabba bar Shila in the name of R. Mothnah quoting Samuel: The case is, that a learned man has finished, yet because of a drop of spittle of a common man which may have fallen upon it, it is treated as unclean. "May

have fallen upon it" when? Should we assume, before it is completed, then it is not yet a vessel; if after, then he takes good care of it? The case may be, before it is completed, yet perhaps at the moment it was made, it was still liquid (and it may be defiled).

"*The vessel includes what is within,*" etc. Whence do we know that? Said R. Hanin: It is written [Num. vii. 14, etc.]: "One spoon of ten shekels of gold, full of incense." The Scripture makes everything that is in the spoon one. R. Kahana objected: We have learned, that R. Aqiba added to the teaching, which immediately follows, the flour and the incense, and the frankincense and the coals, for if the person, in the course of purification, touch the extremity of it, he disqualifies the whole. Now, this addition of R. Aqiba is certainly rabbinical, as the first part of the Mishna states (Edeoth, VIII., 1): R. Simeon b. Bathyr bore testimony with reference to the ashes of the red cow, that if an unclean person touch the extremity of them, he makes all of them unclean; and immediately he says, that R. Aqiba added this? (And R. Hanin says, it is rabbinical.) Said Resh Lakish in the name of Bar Kapara: The addition was only necessary for the rest of the meat-offering. For, biblically, what stands in need of a vessel, the vessel includes it; what does not stand in need of a vessel, the vessel does not include it; but the rabbis went further and ordained that, although a thing does not necessarily belong to a vessel, the vessel, nevertheless, includes it.

"*The unclean in the fourth degree,*" etc. We have learned in a Boraitha: R. Jose said: Whence do we deduce the case of the unclean in the fourth degree, that in the matter of sacred things he is disqualified? By an *a fortiori* argument. For he who has entered on the last stage of his atonement, while he is free as regards heave-offering, he is disqualified as regards sacred things, so much the more when one is unclean in the third degree who defiles heave-offering that he should become disqualified as regards sacred things if unclean in the fourth degree. We have learned, however, that he who is unclean in the third degree is disqualified as regards sacred things, biblically, and that he who is in the fourth degree—by an *a fortiori* argument, namely: It is written [Lev. vii. 9]: "And the flesh that toucheth any unclean thing shall not be eaten." Are we not here treating of the touching of a thing of secondary uncleanness? And nevertheless the Scripture says, it shall not be

eaten? That which is unclean in the fourth degree is proved to be disqualified by the *a fortiori* argument stated above.

"And though one of his hands be unclean." R. Shezbi said: It is only in the case of contact, but not otherwise. Abayi objected: We have learned: A wiped hand renders its fellow unclean so far as to make unclean for sacred things, but not for heave-offering. Such is the dictum of Rabbi. R. Jose b. R. Jehudah says: This is the case so far as to disqualify, but not to render unclean. It is correct if the Mishna treats of a case where it did not come in contact, and therefore the importance of "wiped" hand? But if the case is only when there is contact, but not otherwise, where is the importance of "wiped" hand? It was taught also that Resh Lakish said the Mishna refers only to his own hand, but not to the hand of his companion (R. Johanan, however, says both his own hand and his companion's hand), with the same hand he may only disqualify, but not render unclean. Whence did he learn this? From the fact that it has been taught in the latter portion of the Mishna. For the hand makes its fellow unclean in the case of sacred things, but not in the case of heave-offering. Why the repetition? Was it not taught in the preceding clauses of the same Mishna? We must therefore say, it comes to teach us that the hand of the companion is included. And Resh Lakish himself retracted his decision, as R. Jonah said in the name of R. Ami that Resh Lakish said, whether it be his own hand, or the hand of his companion, with that same hand he may disqualify, but not render unclean.

"We may eat dry food," etc. We have learned in a Boraitha: R. Hanina b. Antigonos said: Does such a question as to whether a thing be dry or wet exist as regards sacred things? Does not love for the sacred things make men cautious in regard to defilement? The Mishna treats of a case, that a man's companion put a piece of the sacred things into his mouth, or he put it into his own mouth with a spindle or with a skewer, or attempted to eat along with these an onion or garlic taken from unconsecrated things. As to sacred things the rabbis ordained so, but as to heave-offering they did not.

"The mourner and he who lacks atonement." Why so? Because they were under restriction, the sages ordained that they shall dip.

MISHNA: More rigorous rules, on the other hand, hold in a heave-offering, for in Judea people are believed with regard to

purity of wine and oil all the days of the year, but at the time of the vintage and the oil-pressing, with regard to heave-offering also.

When the vintage and the oil-pressing are over, and a cask of wine for heave-offering was brought, it must not be received, but it may be left for the next vintage. But if he say to him, I have separated and put into the midst of it a fourth part of something consecrated for sacred things, he is believed. In the case of jugs of wine and jugs of oil which are mixed, men are believed with regard to them at the time of vintage and oil-pressing and for seventy days before the vintage.

GEMARA : In Judea, yes; but in Galilea, no ? Why so ? Said Resh Lakish : Because there is a strip of the Gentiles making a separation between them. But let him bring it in a box, a chest, or in a balloon ? This is in accordance with Rabbi, who said : A tent projected is not a real tent. But let one bring it in an earthenware vessel tied round with a line of thread ? Said R. Eliezer : We have learned in a Boraitha : Sacred things are not preserved from uncleanness by a line of thread.

"But at the time of vintage," etc. There is a contradiction from the following Boraitha : He who finishes his olives shall leave aside one box and place it before the eyes of the priest (in order that he shall examine it as to whether they are not ripe yet, and the priest shall place them in cleanness when they become ripe. Hence we see that even at that time they were not believed?) Said R. Nahman : This presents no difficulty. The one is the case of those early in season, the other of those late in season. Said R. Ada bar Ahba to him : For instance, things like those belonging to the house of thy father. R. Joseph, however, said, the Mishna (in Taaroth) refers to Galilea.

"When the vintage and the oil-pressing are over," etc. The schoolmen questioned of R. Shesheth : Suppose that it is over, and yet he receives it, what about the law that he shall leave it for the next vintage ? He answered them : This we have already learned in the following Mishna (Dmai, VI., 1) : A learned man and a common person who are their father's joint heirs. The common person may say to him : Take thou the wheat that is in such a place, and I will take the wheat that is in such a place ; take thou the wine that is in such a place, and I will take the wine that is in such a place. But he may not say to him : Take thou the liquid and I will take the dry ; take thou the wheat and I will take the barley. And in regard to this we have

learned: That same learned man burns the liquid and leaves the dry. Why? Let him leave it for the next vintage? It may be one of the things that have no vintage. But let him leave it for one of the feasts? It may be one of the things which will not keep till the feast.

"But if he say, I have separated for sacred things, he is believed." We have learned in a Mishna (Choloth, XVIII., 4): Both the School of Shammai and the School of Hillel agree that we are to investigate a field in which a person is buried for those who are to bring the paschal lamb, but not for those who desire to eat heave-offering. What is the meaning of investigate? Said R. Jehudah in the name of Samuel: A man blows upon the unclean land as he walks along.* And R. Hyyya bar Abha in the name of Ula said: An unclean place of this sort that is trodden is clean for those who bring their paschal lambs; as it is a case of Kareth, they did not insist upon their decisions, but for those who desired to eat heave-offering, they did insist on their decisions, as it is a case of death penalty (by Heaven).

"In the case of vessels of wine," etc. There is a Boraitha: They are not believed, either about the cans or about the heave-offering. Cans belonging to what? If they belong to sacred things, then if he is believed about the sacred things, he is believed also about their cans? If the cans belonging to heave-offerings are meant, then it is self-evident. About heave-offering he is not believed—shall he be believed about cans that belong to it? It is a case of sacred cans which are empty, and it is during the remaining days of the year. And the same is the case of those full of heave-offering, and at the time of the vintage they are believed. (And although no precautionary measure was ordained as to their heave-offering, in order not to cause any loss to the priests, still they were not believed as to the cans, and the priests receive from them the heave-offering with the cans, but place the heave-offering in other cans of their own.)

"For seventy days before the vintage." Abayi said: Infer from this that the law is, that the farmer shall go up to dip the casks seventy days before the time of the presses.

MISHNA: From Modiim and inwards men are believed with

* *I.e.*, one who is on the way, bringing the paschal lamb, and comes across a field in which a human body was buried, he may examine it by blowing as he walks along; and if there is a bone of the size of a barley, and he notices it and avoids to walk over it, he does not contract uncleanness, as it does not communicate uncleanness unless by contact.

regard to earthenware vessels; from Modiim and outwards they are not believed. How so? The potter who is selling the pots goes inwards from Modiim. That is the potter, and those are the pots, and those are the buyers. He is believed. If he goes out he is not believed.

GEMARA: We have learned in a Boraitha: The place of Modiim itself is sometimes considered within and sometimes without. How so? When the potter goes out, and the merchant goes in, it is considered within. Both go in, or both go out, it is considered without. Said Abayi: We have learned the same in our Mishna, viz.: The potter who sells the pots and goes *inwards* from Modiim. What about Modiim itself? Is it not believed? Then how is the latter part: When he goes out he is not believed? From this we may infer that Modiim itself is believed. Hence the case is as stated in the Boraitha. Infer therefrom.

MISHNA: The tax collectors who have gone into the midst of a house, and so too the thieves that have restored the vessels, are believed when they say: We have not touched. And in Jerusalem they are believed as regards sacred things, and at the time of a feast as regards heave-offering also.

GEMARA: There is a contradiction from the following Boraitha: In the case of the tax collectors who have gone into the midst of the house, the whole house is unclean? There is no difficulty. The one is when there is a Gentile with them; the other is when there is not a Gentile with them. For there is another Mishna: If there is a Gentile with them, they are believed when they say, We did not enter; but they are not believed when they say, We entered, but we did not touch. And if there is a Gentile with them, what of it? R. Johanan and R. Elazar: One says that they fear that the Gentile should not punish them, and the other says that they fear that the stranger should not give them away to the government. What is the difference between them? A Gentile who is not of importance.

"*And so too the thieves,*" etc. There is a contradiction from the following Boraitha: In the case of the thieves who have gone into the midst of the house, only the place where the thieves' feet trod is unclean. Said R. Pinhas in the name of Rabh: They are to be believed only in the case they have repented. It seems that our Mishna intended the same thing, for the statement is: Who have restored the vessels. Infer from this.

"And in Jerusalem they are believed," etc. We have learned in a Boraitha: They are believed as regards large earthen vessels for sacrifice. And the reason is, because they do not make ovens in Jerusalem.

"And at the time of the feast," etc. Whence is this deduced? Said R. Joshua b. Levi: Because it is written [Judg. xx. 11]: "So all the men of Israel were gathered against the city, associated together as one man." The Scripture makes them all equal.

MISHNA: One that opens his cask, and one that commences his dough at the time of a festival, R. Jehudah says: He shall finish it, but the sages say he shall not.

GEMARA: R. Ami and R. Itz'hak of Naph'ha sat at the portico of the latter. One began and said: According to the sages, may he keep it for another festival? He answered: Every one's hand has been handling it, and dost thou say, he shall keep it for another festival? He said to him: But hitherto as well, has not every one's hand been handling it? He rejoined: What comparison is that? Hitherto the uncleanness of a common person in a festival, the Law makes him clean, but now it is a case of uncleanness.

MISHNA: As soon as the festival is over, they make them pass on to the cleansing of the court. But if the festival is over on a Friday, they do not make them pass on, on account of the honor of the Sabbath. R. Jehudah said: Also not on Thursday, for the priests are not at leisure.

GEMARA: And the Boraitha adds: That the priests are not at leisure because of the removing of the fat.

MISHNA: How is that made out, that they make them pass on to the cleaning of the court? They dip the vessels which were in the Temple, and say to them: Be ye clean that ye touch not the table. All the vessels that were in the Temple had second and third sets, so that if the first became unclean they might bring the second instead of them. All the vessels which were in the Temple were subject to dipping, except the altar of gold and the altar of bronze, because they were like the floor. Such is the dictum of R. Eliezer. But the sages say, because they were overlaid.

GEMARA: We have learned in a Boraitha: Be ye clean lest ye touch the table or the candelabrum. Why did our Mishna not mention the candelabrum? Because the table is called in the Scripture perpetual; the candelabrum is not perpetual.

Resh Lakish said: It is written [Lev. xxiv. 6]: "Upon the pure table." From this it may be inferred that it may be defiled. Why? Is it not a vessel of wood made to rest, and as such is not subject to defilement? Infer from this that the table was raised up and exhibited the shewbread on it to the pilgrims, and they were told: See how beloved you are before the Lord, that the shewbreads are as warm now as they were when placed on the table. For R. Joshua b. Levi said: A great miracle was wrought in the shewbread. As its placing was miraculous so was its end, for it is written [I Sam. xxi. 7]: "So as to put down hot bread on the day when it was taken away." It is written [Ezek. xli. 22]: "The latter was of wood, three cubits high, and its length was two cubits, and its corners and its top-piece and its walls were of wood, and he spoke unto me: This is the table that is before the Lord." He began with "altar" and he ended with "table." R. Johanan and Resh Lakish both say: At the time that the Temple was set up an *altar* made atonement for a man; now a man's *table* makes atonement for him.

"All the vessels that were in the Temple had second and third sets," etc. The altar of bronze, because it is written [Ex. xx. 21]: "An altar of earth shalt thou make unto me." The altar of gold, because it is written [Num. iii. 31]: "The candlestick and the altars." The altars are placed in comparison one with the other.

"Because they are overlaid." On the contrary, since they are overlaid they may become unclean. Said the rabbis to R. Eliezer: Why do you think them capable of defilement, because they are covered over? Their covering is of no avail in respect of them.

R. Abuhu in the name of R. Eliezer said: As to the scholars, the flame of Gehenna has no power over them. For this is shown by an *a fortiori* argument drawn from the salamander. As only the creature of fire, and still he that anoints himself with its blood, flame has no power over him, how much more then that the flames have no power over the scholars, whose whole body is fire, as it is written [Jer. xxiii. 29]: "Is not thus my word like fire? saith the Lord." Resh Lakish said the flame of Gehenna has no power over the transgressors of Israel, as is shown by an *a fortiori* argument from the altar of gold. For the altar of gold, upon which is only about the thickness of a denarius of gold, it lasted so many years and was not affected by fire; how

much less can flame have power over the transgressors of Israel, who are full of the commandments as a pomegranate is full of seeds, as it is written [Song of Songs iv. 3]: "Like the half of a pomegranate is the upper part of thy cheek," etc. Read not "the upper part of thy cheek," but "the vain fellows that are in thee."

END OF TRACT HAGIGA.

7

Stanford University Libraries

3 6105 124 423 869



FEB 29 1979

Stanford University Libraries

3 6105 124 423 869



FEB 20 1979





Stanford University Libraries

3 6105 124 423 869



FEB 29 1979

